



Fredrik Rusk

# Doing Second Language Learning

A CA Study of Learning Practices in Finnish-Swedish Bilingual  
Educational Settings





## Fredrik Rusk

Born 1986 in Esbo, Finland

- Master of Education, Åbo Akademi University 2010
- Research assistant in several research projects, Åbo Akademi University 2008–2011
- Doctoral Student in Education 2010–2016
- Doctoral Student in the Graduate School of Åbo Akademi University 2012–2016
- Doctor of Education dissertation defence, Åbo Akademi University 2016

Cover and portrait photo: Matilda Ståhl



# Doing Second Language Learning

A CA Study of Learning Practices in  
Finnish-Swedish Bilingual Educational Settings

Fredrik Rusk

Education  
Faculty of Education and Welfare Studies  
Åbo Akademi University  
Vasa, Finland, 2016

## **Supervisors**

Professor Michaela Pörn  
Finnish Language Didactics  
Faculty of Education and Welfare Studies  
Åbo Akademi University  
Strandgatan 2, 65100 Vasa  
Finland

Professor Fritjof Sahlström  
Applied Pedagogics  
Faculty of Education and Welfare Studies  
Åbo Akademi University  
Strandgatan 2, 65100 Vasa  
Finland

## **Reviewers**

Professor Arja Piirainen-Marsh  
English  
Department of Languages  
University of Jyväskylä  
Seminaarinkatu 15, 40100 Jyväskylä  
Finland

Docent Nigel Musk  
Senior Lecturer in English  
Department of Culture & Communication  
Linköping University  
Ivar Vidfames gata 29, 12652 Hägersten  
Sweden

## **Opponent**

Professor Arja Piirainen-Marsh  
English  
Department of Languages  
University of Jyväskylä  
Seminaarinkatu 15, 40100 Jyväskylä  
Finland

ISBN 978-952-12-3439-2 (Print)  
ISBN 978-952-12-3440-8 (PDF)  
Painosalama Oy – Turku, Finland 2016

## Abstract

Using a social-interactional perspective on second language learning—founded on a conversation analytic (CA) perspective on social interaction as structured—this thesis investigates second language learning (Finnish or Swedish) in bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) educational settings. Employing CA, the three studies presented in this thesis provide detailed analyses of second language learning in-and-through interaction and discuss both technical and methodological implications of using video and CA in the study of learning in interaction. The aim of this thesis is to describe and understand practices used to perform social actions that participants orient to as second language learning. The focus is on practices that participants—themselves—orient to as doing second language learning and on how these practices are structured and sequentially organized in social interaction. In other words, learning is approached as practices that participants use to perform second language learning as situated actions. This thesis responds to the need for a better understanding of how participants actually do second language learning, and how it is structured and organized in talk-in-interaction. The empirical material consists of video recordings of various bilingual educational settings. These settings include participants' (7–16 year-old children) everyday at school both in- and outside of the classrooms.

The first study discusses three approaches on data construction that emerge from the body of CA studies on learning in interaction and how they affect the subsequent analysis, results, and understanding of learning in interaction. The underlying interests of these studies influence data construction, which, in turn, affects possible analyses. There is considerable variation in the aspects that datasets focus on: an emphasis on setting, participant, or content projects the analytic emphasis. Hence, it is important to be aware of and address this relation between data construction and analysis. The second and third study built on these findings to analyze how participants orient to their own and other's second language knowledge in social interaction. The studies employ CA's framework of epistemics in interaction to capture participants' management of the dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in the production and recognition of second language learning as social action. The second study focuses on situations in which code-switching is not used in an attempt to solve the second language learner's problems of understanding the second language and current assignment. The aim is to investigate participants' interactional management of one another's knowledge regarding the second language—and the current assignment—when maintaining intersubjectivity and doing second language learning. The study shows that the use of the second language in resolving troubles with intersubjectivity may lead participants to act on diverse second language knowledge and diverse possible

understandings regarding the assignments. The use of the second language may result in expanded epistemic discrepancies, as well as restrict doing second language learning on conceptual knowledge, for example, word-meanings. Instead, the participants agree on a minimally required epistemic balance as a way to move on. Building on the understanding of management of dynamic epistemic relationships in situations where participants orient towards doing second language learning, the third study investigates a specific practice— incongruent interrogatives—and how peers use this practice to perform second language learning. The findings indicate that participants—peers—use incongruent interrogatives to initiate instructional sequences and propose epistemically asymmetric positions as participants co-construct situated roles as second language teacher and second language learner as part of doing second language learning. Hence, all studies contribute to the development of an empirical analysis of second language learning as identifiable interactional practices that participants use to perform second language learning as action. These practices are not independent of other practices for maintaining intersubjectivity and meaning-making (such as repair/correction). The practices for doing second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity are, instead, better understood as co-operating. Doing learning is concerned with instruction and a mutual orientation towards changing a participant's knowledge of an oriented-to learning object, whereas the management of epistemic relationships, repair, and other practices for meaning-making are resources for participants to establish and maintain a shared understanding of their joint activities, including learning.

In sum, the thesis contributes to the development of using CA for the analysis and documentation of participants' methods and practices for doing learning as observable interactional phenomena that participants actively relate to.

**Keywords:** learning; second language learning; social interaction; conversation analysis; epistemics in interaction

## Acknowledgements

The journey entitled, "Writing a doctoral thesis," has been a bumpy one. It is comparable to a rollercoaster ride with its ups and downs and in which you—yourself—have to manually push the wagon. However, all-in-all, I truly have enjoyed writing this thesis. It has given me the opportunity to delve into interesting intellectual work, interactional phenomena, and video data. Along the way, I have met interesting people, with whom I have had the pleasure of conversing about themes related to my thesis and research interests. These conversations that have occurred in several places around the world (even "down under"), have been the source of many change-of-state tokens and changes in participation on my part. I am truly indebted to all those who have taken the time to discuss my work with me. Unfortunately, I cannot list everyone.

Firstly, I would like to thank my family. All of you have been so supportive and none of this would have been possible without you rooting for me, and believing in me to actually deliver a thesis after all this time. This work is dedicated to you. However, I am mostly indebted to my beautiful and understanding wife, Hanna, for putting up with me and my idea of doing research instead of pursuing a career as a teacher with a solid income. You are the reason I have the strength to go on. Of course, I would also like to thank my children, Arthur and My, for effectively helping me forget my work during the time we spend together. You are the light of my life. Last, but not least, I think that this man's best friends, Bisse and Tutka, are also worth a mention, since they have been the most loyal exercising and writing companions one could ever find. Come rain or shine.

I am also immensely grateful for having such an awesome main supervisor, Michaela Pörn. She has thoroughly, truthfully, and sincerely supported me as my "doktormutter" in all stages of this work. This work could not have been completed without your help and scaffolding. I would also like to thank my second supervisor, Fritjof Sahlström, for his insightful comments and suggestions to the articles and manuscript. I am especially thankful for all the support regarding video research and CA.

I am also thankful to those who drudged their way through entire sections of my texts and provided thoughtful and wise comments. Especially Annika Turunen, Charlotta Hilli, Carmel Mesiti, and Marie Tanner. While I cannot acknowledge them by name, I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to all the anonymous reviewers to the articles who have helped me refine the research along the way, and—of course—to the external reviewers, Arja Piirainen-Marsh and Nigel Musk, for constructive and helpful comments.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to many colleagues and friends at Åbo Akademi University, the ICCR in Melbourne (David, John,

Aloysius, and others), JURE-team (Jessica, Gloria, Thomas, and others), University of Helsinki (Antti, Jaakko, Tuuli, and others), FLIS-team (Anna, Lotta, Ida, and others), Klasstandem-team (Charlotta, Katri, Anna), Matilda Ståhl, and all the people involved in other projects I have worked in (Skolspråk, Språkmöten, Textmöten), you know who you are.

A windy day in Vasa, 2016

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Fredrik Rusk". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

*Fredrik Rusk*



## Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1. Background.....	10
1.2. Bilingual educational settings.....	12
1.3. Aim.....	15
1.4. Overview of the thesis.....	16
<b>2. The point of departure.....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1. A social-interactional perspective on second language learning.....	17
2.2. The social organization of talk-in-interaction .....	19
2.3. Using conversation analysis to study learning: from classrooms to learning in interaction.....	21
2.4. Conversation analysis and second language learning.....	24
<b>3. Epistemics in interaction .....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1. Epistemic status and stance .....	30
3.2. The interplay between status and stance: congruence, balance and discrepancy.....	32
3.3. Epistemics as a relevant part of doing second language learning.....	35
<b>4. On (some) methodological positions and the basic analytic method of conversation analysis.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>5. Research contexts and data construction .....</b>	<b>45</b>
5.1. Communicative Finnish as second language program .....	45
5.2. Classroom tandem .....	46
5.3. Multilingual seven-year-old children's everyday at school.....	48
5.4. A content-centered data construction .....	49
5.5. Transcription .....	54
5.6. Ethical considerations.....	55
<b>6. Summaries of the studies.....</b>	<b>58</b>

6.1. Study 1.....	58
6.2. Study 2.....	60
6.1. Study 3.....	64
<b>7. Discussion.....</b>	<b>69</b>
7.1. Data construction is part of the analysis of learning in interaction.....	69
7.2. Management of knowledge of languages in bilingual second language educational settings.....	74
7.3. A practice for performing second language learning as social action.....	78
<b>8. Sammanfattning.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>112</b>
Appendix 1. Transcript symbols.....	112
<b>The studies.....</b>	<b>113</b>
Study 1: Perspectives on using video recordings in conversation analytical studies on learning in interaction	
Study 2: The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance	
Study 3: Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions – incongruent interrogative-practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction	



# 1. Introduction

The research reported here is an investigation of second language learning (Finnish and Swedish) in bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) educational settings. The starting point of the thesis is the social-interactional perspective on language learning—which purports that learning is situated in social situations and contexts where participants are engaged in mutual social actions (see, e.g., Firth & Wagner, 2007; Kääntä, 2010; Seedhouse, Walsh, & Jenks, 2010)—and a conversation analytic (CA) perspective on social interaction as structured and organized.

## 1.1. Background

CA has not been traditionally used in studies on second language learning (Gardner, 2012). However, there is growing research on second language learning arguing that CA's emic participant's perspective and understanding of the organization of social interaction can be used to better understand learning and cognition as social phenomena (e.g., Gardner, 2012; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Kääntä, 2010; Lee, 2010; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Sahlström, 2011; Seedhouse et al., 2010; Slotte-Lüttge, Pörn, & Sahlström, 2012). CA and its emic perspective on social interaction provide tools to analyze how participants understand and orient to their situated social practices as learning. That is, identifying which aspects (categories, actions, and activities) participants make relevant and co-construct in the local context.

Currently, there is a small group of studies that argue for a view on learning as sets of practices that can be observed, analyzed, and conceptualized within CA as social action that participants actively orient to and do (e.g., Lee, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Sahlström, 2011). In other words, this group of studies argues that learning can be identified, described, and understood as social action that is part of human social organization and conceptualized within CA. Learning is then analyzed from an emic participant's perspective by considering the learning object as an emergent shared pedagogical focus that is locally established, co-constructed, and relevant for the participants doing learning as social action (Lee, 2010; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Sahlström, 2011). However, there is still much work left to do regarding this area of CA research on learning and second language learning. There are many issues, which need to be addressed and discussed, for example, identifying practices that are oriented-to by participants as learning as social action and how these practices are emically co-constructed, produced, and understood as doing learning by participants in the unfolding social interaction.

This thesis is an attempt to respond to this gap in CA research on second language learning and investigate how participants actively orient to their situated practices as doing second language learning. Thus, learning is

considered a primary phenomenon that is done by participants “in the first instance” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 165) and conceptualized within CA. Research on learning as social action considers epistemics in interaction—the dynamic relationships between participants’ knowledge of the oriented-to learning object(s) in relation to each other—as vital in the practices used to do learning. Therefore, in an attempt to analyze how participants orient to both their own and other’s knowledge in the social interaction, this thesis employs CA’s analytical framework of epistemics in interaction (e.g., Goodwin, 2013; Heritage, 2012b; Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011). More specifically, the research reported here draws on Heritage’s notions of epistemic status and stance in participants’ co-constructed management of knowledge in interaction (Heritage, 2012b; Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d). Through CA’s sequential analysis and the analysis of epistemics in interaction it is possible to discover how participants orient to and act on small details in the interaction and how they organize their coordinated mutual practices in-and-through them to do learning. That is, how they orient towards changing and developing their understanding and knowledge of situationally and emically relevant learning objects in concert with one or several co-participants. Therefore, the focus of the analyses in the present thesis is on practices that participants orient to as doing second language learning and on how those practices are structured and organized in social interaction.

To do this, the thesis employs video recordings of naturally occurring settings (Mondada, 2012b; Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, 2007). These settings are participants’ (7–16 year-old children, see section 1.2) everyday at school, both in- and outside of classrooms. The entire data construction (e.g., recordings, selection, transcription) is part of the analysis. In other words, the researcher constructs the data when making choices in each stage of data collection, therefore the term “data construction” is used. The aim of CA research, and this thesis, is to study the actual social organization of human interaction in-and-through an emic participant’s perspective throughout the entire process, including data construction and analysis. The approach to data construction used in CA studies on learning in interaction that best reflects the thesis’ data construction and analyses is the content-centered approach (Rusk, Pörn, Sahlström, & Slotte-Lüttge, 2014). Studies using a content-centered approach of data construction record settings and situations where the practice(s) or content(s) of interest will most likely emerge in the talk-in-interaction (see section 5.4). The data construction of the thesis was to capture specific practices through which co-constructed second language learning objects are oriented to and made relevant by the participants in the talk-in-interaction. Hence, bilingual educational settings in which both formal and informal second language learning could be captured were chosen as settings for the empirical studies included in the present thesis.

## 1.2. Bilingual educational settings

In-and-through the talk-in-interaction, participants attend to the organization of knowledge in the settings that they are part of (cf. Goodwin, 2013). For example, participants attend to the circumstances regarding knowledge of first and second languages. This includes, among others, expectations regarding others' knowledge of the languages used and responsibilities of one's own knowledge of the situationally relevant languages (cf. Heritage, 2012a). Hence, social settings can be understood as permeated by expectations of, for example, language knowledge. Participants' orientation to each other's background knowledge of languages (epistemic status) and their situationally expressed knowledge of languages (epistemic stance) are important resources for participants in their meaning-making and for the analysis of situations in which they do second language learning. It is, therefore, important to point out the particularities of bilingual settings that are investigated in this study to better understand participants' practices when doing second language learning. This study will contribute, more generally, to research on doing second language learning as social action and, more particularly, to research on second language learning in bilingual settings, such as the one described as follows.

Besides Finnish, Swedish is an official language in Finland and 5.5% of the population of approximately 5.2 million report Swedish as their first language. The status of Swedish as an official language gave rise to a parallel school system from kindergarten to university with either Finnish or Swedish as the language of instruction. Both school systems follow the same curriculum and teach the other official national language as a second language. Teaching of the second national language has recently been subject of criticism, as children do not learn to communicate in the second national language well enough. Parents and language teachers spoke out in the media, saying that the methods used in the second national language education were outdated and that the focus was too much on form (vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar) at the expense of communication and function (see, e.g., Pörn & Norrman, 2011). Parallel to, and in some ways, included in, the debate regarding the form-focused nature of teaching the second national language (Toropainen, 2010; Tuokko, 2009), an intensive discussion and debate on the possibilities of creating bilingual schools in Finland has emerged on the premise that Finland is officially a bilingual country. The debate concerns mainly how a bilingual school would be organized regarding language use in a Finnish context and which school system would operationalize bilingual schools (Swedish-speaking or Finnish-speaking). To this end, several projects to promote more communicative methods in the teaching of the second national language were started, two of which are included in the present thesis (see Chapter 5).

The research contexts of the present study include two different bilingual areas in Finland: Finnish-Swedish bilingual Ostrobothnia and a Finn-

ish-dominated part of the Helsinki-area. This is to better represent the Finnish-Swedish bilingual context and to capture both formal and informal doing of second language learning. Video recordings of a Finnish as second language program for seven-year-old Swedish-speaking children and a classroom tandem course, which is a model for language instruction organized in mixed language groups (Finnish and Swedish as second language) for 16-year-old students in upper-secondary school, are from a Finnish-Swedish bilingual area in Ostrobothnia (see sections 5.1 and 5.2). Video recordings of seven-year-old multilingual children's everyday interaction at preschools and primary schools are from a Finnish-dominated part in the Helsinki-area and from a Finnish-Swedish bilingual area in Ostrobothnia (see section 5.3). The second language learning investigated in this thesis is therefore situated in educational settings that are bilingual (Finnish-Swedish).

Swedish-speaking children are generally expected to have at least basic communicative knowledge of Finnish. However, the language groups live relatively parallel lives (e.g., Holm & Londen, 2010), which means that some Swedish-speaking children may have very limited and restricted contact with the Finnish language if they come from a Swedish-speaking family, have Swedish-speaking relatives and go to Swedish-speaking school with Swedish-speaking friends. In some areas of Finland, it is the norm for Swedish-speaking children to have limited exposure to Finnish in their everyday, such as along the western coast of Finland and on Åland. Finnish-speaking children, on the other hand, are not generally expected to have much contact with Swedish, since Swedish is a minority language. But in certain areas of Finland it is still quite common for Finnish-speaking children to have at least heard or used Swedish in some situations in their everyday. Nevertheless, if they do not have Swedish-speaking friends or relatives they are only marginally exposed to Swedish.

The amount of bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) children in Swedish-speaking schools have increased considerably due to the fact that the majority (approximately 70 percent) of children from linguistically mixed families go to Swedish-speaking schools (Tandefelt & Finnäs, 2007). On the assumption that the child is able to study in the language of the school (Finnish or Swedish), families have the right to choose between the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking school. In practice, the choice of school is made already when the children start daycare, as the future language of instruction in most cases will be the same as that employed at the daycare center (Lojander-Visapää, 2001). Multilingualism in Finland, and especially in Swedish-speaking schools, has for a long time incorporated almost only Finnish and Swedish. However, the recent rise in immigration means that several languages now represent multilingualism in Finland (Holm & Londen, 2010; OSF, 2008). Nonetheless, the settings under scrutiny in this thesis are dominated by Finnish-Swedish bilingualism.

In 2013, the number of children from Finnish-Swedish bilingual homes

amounted to approximately 40% of all students in Forms 1–6 in Swedish-speaking schools in the entire country, and to 23% and 61% in Ostrobothnia and the Helsinki area, respectively (Finnish National Board of Education, 2013; Mansikka & Holm, 2011). There is, in other words, area-wise variation in the distribution of Finnish-Swedish bilingual students in the Swedish-speaking schools. This also affects the expectations of language knowledge that the participants orient to and act upon. However, in the present settings most of the participants had at least some previous knowledge of the second language they were learning and/or teaching (Finnish or Swedish). Consequently, the participants were largely able to achieve and maintain a shared understanding of their mutual actions using either Finnish or Swedish. The bilingual settings investigated in this thesis are not traditional second/foreign language educational settings in which the second language that is taught and learned is previously unknown to the language learners (cf. Cekaite, 2006; García, 2009; Hall et al., 2011; He, 2004; Jakonen, 2014b; Majlesi, 2015; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2010). The participants in these bilingual settings usually had either Finnish or Swedish as their first language and had at least novice knowledge of and some exposure to the other language, that is, the second language. Another aspect that is worth mentioning regarding the settings is that differences in cultural aspects of the Finnish- and the Swedish-speaking populations are small. Both cultures have their specificities and differences, but they seldom interfere with interactional meaning-making across linguistic boundaries. In other settings that have been studied in research on second language learning the cultures of the two languages may differ (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004; Cekaite & Evaldsson, 2008; Mori, 2004; Mori, 2006; Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Walsh & Li, 2013; Wong, 2000; Young & Miller, 2004; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005).

Previous research indicates that the majority language (Finnish) seems to be an expected everyday competence. This is indicated by the fact that the school may be one of few settings where some children that attend a Swedish-speaking school come in contact with the Swedish language (cf. Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman, 2013). There is an emphasis on supporting children’s Swedish in Swedish-speaking schools in Finnish-dominated language contexts because, according to teachers, Swedish is regarded as the weaker language for many children in comparison to Finnish (e.g., Sahlström et al., 2013). Consequently, language competence in both Swedish and Finnish is expected in these settings (Slotte-Lüttge, Pörn & Sahlström, 2012). The status of Finnish as a majority language seems to project it as an expected competence in the above-mentioned settings, whereas expectations regarding the minority language (Swedish) are much lower, if at all, for Finnish-speaking children. Finnish-speaking children in several areas of Finland may not have the opportunity to hear/speak Swedish outside of language lessons at school. Therefore, the expected knowledge regarding



the two national languages are different. However, not all Swedish-speaking children are bilingual in practice. As statistics demonstrate, Ostrobothnia is (at least partly) strongly Swedish-speaking and in these areas of Finland Swedish-speaking children may not have been exposed to Finnish to the same extent as their Swedish-speaking peers in Finnish-dominated areas. Nevertheless, these children may still be expected to have knowledge of Finnish. This is because Finnish is the majority language and is therefore often an expected competence. However, Swedish-speaking children in Swedish-speaking areas may have as little knowledge of Finnish as Finnish-speaking children may have of Swedish because of the infrequent exposure to each language. It is important to highlight these macro-level circumstances and expectations because they are an inevitable part of the participants' everyday settings that are analyzed in the present thesis (cf. Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman, 2013; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012).

### **1.3. Aim**

To understand and further the knowledge of language learning, it is imperative to investigate how language learning is actually done and performed in-and-through the contingency of human social interaction (Lee, 2010, p. 418). This thesis responds to the need for a better understanding of how participants do second language learning and how it is structured and organized in the talk-in-interaction. Using CA, the aim is to describe and understand practices used to perform social actions that participants orient to as second language learning. I argue for a situated, content-centered perspective on second language learning as social action. In other words, learning is approached and analyzed as practices that participants use to perform second language learning as action in the here and now. This area is underexplored in the current literature, and the studies included in this thesis further our understanding of what particular practices—connected to epistemics in interaction—participants invoke and do as part of doing second language learning.

The studies in this thesis present a basic sequential description of an organization of practices used by participants to perform learning as social action. The thesis also contributes to the study of participants' management of knowledge as part of practices for doing learning and meaning-making. That is, practices for doing second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity are better understood as co-operating. Put simply, doing learning is concerned with instruction, and participants establish and maintain a shared understanding of their joint activities, including learning, in-and-through the management of their own and other's knowledge in the talk-in-interaction. The thesis begins the enterprise by identifying three approaches to data construction that CA studies on learning appear to employ (Study 1). In each approach learning is conceived differently and the

content-centered approach is appropriate for the thesis' objective. In-and-through this approach on data construction, the thesis presents an analysis of participants' knowledge management when orienting towards second language learning. Thus, using the epistemics framework and an understanding of the complex epistemic circumstances when bilingual participants do second language learning (Study 2). Building on this understanding of complex epistemic circumstances, the thesis analyzes a recurrent practice—incongruent interrogatives—and other practices around it that participants appear to use to perform second language learning as social action (Study 3).

#### **1.4. Overview of the thesis**

The second (2) chapter situates the study within the social-interactional perspective on language learning and the theoretical perspective of CA on studying learning and language learning. Section 2.1 situates the study by presenting a brief overview of the social-interactional perspective and section 2.2 provides a short background of CA as well as a sketch of the CA perspective on social interaction. The section is concluded by a discussion on a number of issues and challenges when using CA to study learning and language learning (2.3). Section 2.4 provides an overview of CA studies on second language learning. The CA framework of epistemics in interaction, which the present thesis heavily relies on, is presented in Chapter 3. The section is concluded with a discussion on how the framework of epistemics in interaction within CA can support the analysis of learning as social action (3.3). Chapter 4 describes and reviews the main analytical methods employed in the present study to analyze and study second language learning as social action. The research contexts (5.1–5.3), data construction (5.4), and transcription (5.5) are presented. The section is concluded with a discussion on ethical issues arising in video studies such as this one (5.6). Chapter 6 includes summaries of the three studies that are included in this thesis. The thesis is concluded by Chapter 7, which includes a discussion on the findings, their implications, and suggestions for further research.

## 2. The point of departure

In this chapter I will shortly elaborate on the social-interactional perspective on second language learning and give a brief overview of CA's background and explain how CA's understanding of the social organization of talk-in-interaction can help better understand learning from a social-interactional perspective. I conclude the section with a discussion on a number of issues and challenges that arise when using CA to study learning and language learning.

### 2.1. A social-interactional perspective on second language learning

The present study is situated in the social-interactional perspective on language learning (Firth & Wagner, 2007; Käätä, 2010) and employs CA as the primary theoretical and methodological framework to study second language learning as social action. Research on second language learning, or second language acquisition (SLA), is a field of theoretical pluralism (Ellis, 2010). Ellis points out that this is evident in the surveys of second language learning that have been conducted, since they review everything from five to ten different theories on second language learning (Ellis, 2010, pp. 23–24). In this section I will not delve into the depths of this pluralism. However, I will provide a brief overview on two major macro-perspectives on second language learning (social and cognitive, see Ellis, 2010, pp. 23–24) and focus on elaborating on the social-interactional perspective, which the present study is situated in.

There is a divide between social and cognitive perspectives in studies on second language learning and the field of SLA (Ellis, 2010, p. 24):

In recent years, a debate has arisen centred around not specific theories but rather the general approach to theory-building in SLA. SLA has become a site of controversy, with some researchers viewing SLA as essentially a cognitive enterprise and others seeing it as a social phenomenon.

Research within the field of SLA is varied. However, the field has core interests, theoretical preferences and methodologies that mainly involve a cognitive view on acquisition and an ontological dichotomy between language use and language acquisition. The references to SLA in this study are references to the institutionalized field of study; not to the dichotomy between language acquisition and language learning (e.g., Firth, 1998). Furthermore, the present study acknowledges the debate that has been raging since the 1990s regarding alternative approaches to second language learning and SLA, and whether they are in- or outside of the field of SLA (see, e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Firth, 1998; Firth and Wagner, 2007; Gass, 1998; Lafford, 2007). However, this thesis is not a study in the field of SLA. It is a study on second language learning from a learning-in-interaction perspective that views lan-

guage use and language learning as interactionally achieved and in which the emic participant's perspective is essential.

Since the 1970s, most studies on second language learning in interaction have viewed learning as a cognitive, individual process (cf. Gass, 2003; Hatch, 1978; Long, 1996). However, since the 1990s, the understanding of learning and language learning has undergone substantial changes, leaning towards a more social-interactional perspective (see, e.g., Käätä, 2010; Seedhouse et al., 2010). These two perspectives lead to widely different ways of understanding, analyzing, and describing second language learning (see Ellis, 2010 for a discussion on the two perspectives). The social-interactional approach is still in its early stages of development. It focuses on "learning-in-and-through-social-interaction" without cognitivist underpinnings. The studies employing a social-interactional perspective on language learning approach learning in several ways, but what all of them have in common is the emphasis on learning and development as a social and interactive phenomenon that is socially constructed in-and-through participants' situated activities in social interaction (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Firth & Wagner, 2007). Therefore, learning and a socially shared cognition are considered to be situated in social situations and contexts where participants are engaged in mutual social actions, which differs from a more traditional and typical perspective on learning as an individual cognitive process that happens in the individual's mind (e.g., Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Hall et al., 2011; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1993; Lee, 2010; Melander, 2009; Melander, 2012b; Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Sahlström, 2011).

One difference between the cognitive and social perspective on second language learning is the understanding of language use and language learning (Ellis, 2010, p. 48; Pekarek Doehler, 2010). In the cognitive perspective there is a clearer distinction between use and acquisition (e.g., Gass, 1998), whereas the social perspective employs a more holistic view on language use and language learning. The move from an individual and mental understanding towards a more social-interactional understanding of language learning has largely gone hand-in-hand with a reconceptualization of language use and language learning. A more usage-based view of language as dynamic and adaptive, and a perspective on learning a language as a continuous adaptation to changing contexts have gained ground (cf. Pekarek Doehler, 2010). This perspective is in contrast to a static notion of linguistic knowledge as independent of context, and of learning as intra-psychological and cognitive. These developments within the social perspective on second language learning highlighted the need to question the separation of language learning and language use (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Firth, 1998; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Kasper, 2009; Markee & Kasper, 2004). Hence, language use and language learning are understood as interconnected and learning is viewed "as a set of socially distributed practices that are situated in the interactional space between conversational partners" (Markee, 2004,

p. 593). The goal is, in other words, to track learning as it emerges in-and-through participants' practices involving the use of the second language. This perspective on learning relies on an understanding of social interaction as the bedrock for human sociality, as well as the basis for linguistic and mental functioning (e.g., Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Garfinkel, 1967) and, consequently, as the foundation for the study of language learning (Pekarek Doehler, 2010).

There is no clear analytical approach that is used in studies on second language learning from a social-interactional perspective, but the number of studies using CA's understanding of social organization to better understand learning in interaction is steadily increasing, suggesting that CA is an analytical approach that is appropriate (see, e.g., Gardner, 2012; Hall et al., 2011; Jakonen, 2014a; Lee, 2010; Lee & Hellermann, 2014; Lilja, 2014; Markee, 2000; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009a; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010; Sahlström, 2011; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012 and several others).

## 2.2. The social organization of talk-in-interaction

The origins of the field of CA lie in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's work in the 1960s<sup>2</sup>. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson were interested in studying language use as a sociological phenomenon, that is, to understand how language is used to perform diverse social actions when participants are engaged in joint activities (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). CA's key interest lies in the organization of social norms and practices that permeate the social organization of everyday interaction, that is, the "interactional architecture" of people's everyday (cf. Seedhouse, 2004). The point of departure for any CA study is that social interaction is highly organized and orderly. Meaning-making and mutual understanding in interaction would be impossible without this orderliness and it must necessarily be oriented-to by interactants. CA is mainly an approach to social action and considers talk as better examined regarding action and what talk is doing, instead of focusing on what talk is about (Schegloff, 1996). From a methodological point of view, CA seeks to uncover the methods, practices, and patterns that participants use to perform and interpret social action.

Much research in CA is concerned with language use. The name also gives a perception of it having its roots in linguistics, but CA's background lies in sociology and—more specifically—in two perspectives on human social interaction (for a more thorough discussion on CA's background and early influences see, e.g., Maynard, 2012): (1) the Goffmanian "interaction order" (1983) and (2) Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology that emphasizes

---

<sup>2</sup> The formation of Sacks's ideas are documented in his lectures from 1964–1972 (Sacks, 1995).

the socially constructed nature of action and the role of shared methods and shared understanding of joint activities (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). The first perspective derives from Goffman's argument of an "interaction order" (Goffman, 1983). It proposes that interaction is constrained by external norms, practices, and actions that a society's members recognize and orient to (Sidnell, 2012a). Human social interaction constitutes an institutional order that consists of normative rights and obligations that largely function independent of persons and regulate the interaction (Drew & Heritage, 2006). However, these norms, practices, and actions are only real as long as members of society recognize and use them to organize their conduct in social interaction (Sidnell, 2012a). Social interaction is, in itself, an institution that is talked into being by participants in the talk-in-interaction. Influence from this perspective led conversation analysts to study not particular utterances per se, but the interactional organization—sequential organization (Schegloff, 2007)—that appears to exist below the conscious level of awareness of the ordinary person engaged in social interaction. The second perspective is that of Garfinkel's (Garfinkel, 1967; Maynard & Weathersbee, 2007) ethnomethodology, which emphasizes that social actions are contingent on the social context of their use and that the understanding of social actions is, thus, socially and situationally constructed. Ethnomethodology stresses that participants employ shared methods when producing, recognizing, and understanding joint activities. The origin of CA lies in a fusion of these two perspectives: the institutional order of interaction provides a structure for social actions as they are produced, recognized, and analyzed in the unfolding interaction, in real time, through participants' use of shared methods and understanding.

CA investigates people's social actions as part of mundane activities that people do and accomplish in their everyday lives. It studies how participants' individual actions are part of larger coordinated and collaborated activities that have an orderly and sequential structure (Goodwin, 2000; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell & Stivers, 2012). The primary interest of pure or traditional CA lies in the organization of the embodiment of human sociality—participants' actions, activities, and conduct in interaction through the use of embodied actions and language (e.g., Sacks & Schegloff, 1974; Sacks, 1995; Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff & Jefferson, 1977). From an emic CA perspective—participant's perspective—the organizations of talk-in-interaction are not automatically running processes; they are the on-going sense-making practices of social interaction. In other words, CA focuses on what is observable and recognizable in participants' embodied social actions (Goodwin, 2000) and not on social actions as expressions of the individual mind. How participants understand situations there and then and how they orient to the situation are central to analysis which, in turn, is based on systematically established empirical findings situated in "naturally occurring settings" (Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, 2007). In other words, the interaction is not ana-

lyzed as a phenomenon that occurs with other primary phenomena. The interaction is the primary phenomenon, which has a structure and shape. The analysis is inductive and the focus of the analysis is on what the participants do at a particular time and in a particular situation. The analysis is, therefore, grounded in how participants understand actions in the interaction and not by deconstructing ready-made classes or categories (e.g., Schegloff, 2007). The series of turns can be tracked for what participants may be doing through them, which responses may be relevant or possible, and where the sequence is going. In other words, what outcomes do the participants pursue? This is what CA literature calls a “next turn proof procedure” (Sacks & Schegloff, 1974).

### **2.3. Using conversation analysis to study learning: from classrooms to learning in interaction**

CA was originally a sociological enterprise and has not historically been used in studies on learning, development, or cognition in social interaction (Gardner, 2012). Nevertheless, the number of studies on learning within CA is steadily increasing and CA is also used in several other fields of inquiry (see, e.g., Sidnell & Stivers, 2012 for a thorough review of CA and its applications in other disciplines).

Early CA studies on learning focused the social organization in an institution in which learning was most likely to take place: the classroom (cf. Gardner, 2012). Several CA studies on learning and classrooms are part of a field within CA called “institutional CA”. One classic example of institutional classroom CA is Mehan’s (1979) classroom study. The focus of the study was the social organization of the classroom. In the analysis, question–answer pairs and topically tied sequences of those pairs were identified. A majority of instances were what later has become known as the prototypical whole-class three-part form, “Initiation, Response and Evaluation” (IRE, see, e.g., Macbeth, 2003; Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Participants and practices were central in the analysis. However, the focus of data construction and analysis was on interactional patterns in the classroom and not on learning. The difference between pure CA and a form of CA that analyzes institutions, including classrooms is that the former investigates interaction as a social institution per se, whereas the latter investigates how social institutions are upheld and managed in interaction, that is, how institutions are talked into being (Heritage, 1997). Institutional CA generally compares the institutional interaction to ordinary conversation. The institutional interaction is understood as being more constrained, systematized, and restricted regarding the practices that participants can employ (Heritage, 2005). With a focus on second language classrooms, Seedhouse and Walsh (2010, p. 131) mention that:

Processes of socially-distributed cognition are inseparable from the

structures of ordinary conversation itself. In the same way, if we wish to fully understand the processes of socially-distributed cognition and 'learning' in relation to instructed second language acquisition, it is vital to understand how second language classroom interaction is organised, and how this differs from ordinary conversation.

CA's view on context, that it is both context-shaped and context-shaping (Seedhouse, 2004; ten Have, 2006), as well as how participants talk the institutional context into being through the sequential unfolding of the interaction are vital when investigating institutional interaction with the help of CA (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; Heritage, 2005). When invoking the institution into being, participants also talk their respective roles into being (the roles of teacher and student, and first or second language speaker or learner). The institutional nature of the interaction can be traced in-and-through six features: (1) overall structural organization, (2) sequential organization of the social interaction, (3) turn-taking, (4) turn design, (5) lexical choices that participants make, and (6) knowledge (epistemic) asymmetries that exist between the participants in the setting (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; Heritage, 2005). In the second language classroom the institution is talked into being through, for example, the three-part instructional sequence (IRE). The classroom is also talked into being through the fact that the teacher generally allocates turns (e.g., Kääntä, 2010), and has an institutionally sanctioned status as more knowledgeable regarding the taught and oriented-to content, such as the second language (Koole, 2012; Sidnell, 2012b). Another knowledge asymmetry is regarding participants' relative knowledge of the first and second language, as well as expectations of language knowledge, both of the first and second language. Learning, in most CA studies on classrooms, is viewed as an intrinsic part of the institutional classroom interaction and the examination of participants' actions in the classroom is crucial for understanding, for example, how affordances for learning are created.

Most CA studies on learning have chosen the path that Mehan (1979) took, namely, to apply CA's strengths (the analysis of the sequential organization in interaction) and describe participants' practices in the classroom as they talk the classroom into being and orient to each others' roles (e.g., teacher/student). Few CA studies claim to study learning as their primary focus. This may be because using CA to study learning, cognition, and/or development in interaction is not without its issues. As Gardner (Gardner, 2012, p. 606) states: "... the question concerning what, or even whether, CA can contribute to studies of classroom learning (for instance, language learning) is a more controversial one" and CA is, according to Hall (2004), an exceptional methodology for analyzing and describing social action, but not learning. The question is then, what if one would pursue learning as social action, that is, as part of CA's focal domain? And what if CA would be used to analyze both learning as social action and at the same time attend to



participants' co-operative practices for meaning-making and maintaining a shared understanding of their joint activities?

The biggest issue with using CA in learning studies is that CA is not a learning theory and CA does not typically investigate internal cognitive, learning, processes (He, 2004). Markee and Kasper (2004) suggest that learning should be considered as constructed in interaction and cognition seen as socially distributed rather than individual. Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) also agree that CA is unable to analyze individual's cognitive states and that CA cannot give analysts a window into what participants "really mean". Nevertheless, they argue, like Markee and Kasper (2004), that CA can analyze and access participants' social displays of their cognitive states and the socially-distributed cognition. CA has a good understanding of the so-called next turn proof procedure (see section 2.2, Sacks & Schegloff, 1974) and through this understanding and analysis CA can access participants' social displays of their cognitive states. Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) argue for a difference between a participant's actual cognitive state and social displays of cognitive states, since CA is able to analyze how participants maintain intersubjectivity<sup>3</sup>: a socially-distributed cognition. One of CA's key objectives is to study how participants can achieve a shared understanding of mutual actions. Some studies go even further, arguing that learning is social and situated. For example, Melander (2009; 2012b) incorporates the social-interactional perspective into CA's emic perspective on participants' social displays of cognitive states. According to Melander, learning can be understood and studied as situated cognition in change. The meaningful organization of social interaction (CA's main interest of study) can be used as a premise for the assertion of the inherently intertwined aspects of cognition and interaction (Melander, 2009; Melander, 2012b). Consequently, when employing a social view on learning, CA has excellent tools to analyze learning from an emic perspective (e.g., Kasper, 2009; Lee, 2010).

CA studies on learning and the social-interactional perspective on learning seems to provide a stable starting point for an effort to conceptualize learning within the CA perspective itself (cf. Goodwin, 2006; Schegloff, 2006). Gardner (2012) mentions that future CA studies on learning can: (1) study learning practices as actions in which participants orient towards learning and/or (2) collect longitudinal data in order to observe changes in participation over time. The present study does the former in that it

---

<sup>3</sup> The term intersubjectivity is multifaceted and research has been conducted on what it is in several different fields (e.g., sociology and philosophy). This thesis relies on CA-studies and the CA understanding of the term intersubjectivity (e.g., Schegloff, 1992). In talk-in-interaction, as understood from a CA perspective, participants display understandings of each others' conduct and actions in the interaction and build the grounding for intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity is maintained moment-by-moment and turn-by-turn on a micro level by participants in the social interaction, enabling them to have a shared understanding of their mutual social actions and activities.

investigates second language learning as social action that participants actively orient to and do. However, a view on learning as social action does not exclude the fact that participants also co-operatively employ practices for establishing and maintaining intersubjectivity (see, e.g., Lee & Hellermann, 2014, p. 766). In other words, learning as social action is “constructed in and through the talk of participants” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496). An issue concerning the analysis is distinguishing between learning practices and practices through which intersubjectivity is maintained. One way to deal with this is to employ CA’s rigorously systematic framework for detailed microanalysis from an emic participant’s perspective. Therefore, the analysis can tell the practices apart by focusing on how participants orient to the local context and the situated activities of the social interaction as learning. As Goodwin (2000, p. 1489) states:

...a primordial site for the analysis of human language, cognition, and action consists of a situation in which multiple participants are attempting to carry out courses of action in concert with each other through talk, while attending to both the larger activities that their current actions are embedded within, and relevant phenomena in their surround.

The social-interactional perspective on second language learning considers learning as social phenomena that are observable by participants engaged in social interaction. This implies that it is available for all participants to understand and act upon in the talk-in-interaction. Learning that is visible and available for participants in the talk-in-interaction is also visible and available for analysis through a theoretical and methodological framework, such as CA and its understanding of the social organization through an emic perspective.

## **2.4. Conversation analysis and second language learning**

In the late 1990s, the field of CA classroom research and CA research on learning grew rapidly (cf. Gardner, 2012). During the same time, the domain of CA studies on second language learning saw a significant growth following the publication of Firth and Wagner’s (1997) then controversial article criticizing the main approach in the field of SLA from an emic CA perspective (see, e.g., Lafford, 2007 for a thorough review of the case). At present three categories can be discerned in CA research on learning and second language learning. The first category includes studies that focus on the social organization of the classroom, the second includes studies that identify and describe changes in CA phenomena over a longitudinal time as learning, and the third includes studies that consider learning as social action that can be conceptualized in-and-through CA.

Most CA studies on language learning focus on the organization of the interaction in teaching/learning-institutions and are therefore examples of studies in the field of institutional CA. They argue for a link between social interaction and learning (e.g., Cekaite, 2006; He, 2004; Käätä, 2010; Lil-

ja, 2010; Markee, 2004; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Niemelä, 2008; Seedhouse, 2004; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005). They study the organization of the social interaction in, for example, classrooms, and argue with the help of sociocultural and/or social-interactional learning theories that there are potential situations in which learning can be done. Other studies on language learning identify changes in a participant's use of a structural-sequential phenomenon, that is, the interactional competence of the participant (e.g., Wootton, 1997). Longitudinal changes in the use of the structural-sequential phenomenon are then considered learning and development. Wootton's (1997) monograph is an early example of this type of study. It is, however, a study on language development and not a study on second language learning. Nonetheless, it prominently exemplifies the analysis of changes in structural-sequential phenomena as learning, which is a field that several CA studies on second language learning have continued to develop. Wootton empirically argues for a sequential approach to study learning and development. He uses CA to analyze a child's development and change in performing requests over several years. He explores the possibilities of relying on CA's cornerstone, sequential analysis, for studying learning, development, and the interactional competence of the child.

The field of CA on second language learning has further developed the longitudinal analysis of structural-sequential phenomena as signs of development of interactional competence and language learning (e.g., Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Cekaite, 2007; Gardner, 2007; Lee & Hellermann, 2014; Hellermann, 2009; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009a; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009b; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Young & Miller, 2004). An example is Young and Miller's (2004) study wherein they analyze how an adult Vietnamese learner of English shows an increased interactional competence regarding turn-taking and the sequential organization of the practice of participating in weekly writing conferences with an instructor over four weeks. CA studies on second language learning that identify changes in participants' uses of structural-sequential phenomena have contributed greatly to furthering the understanding of second language learning as a social phenomenon. However, they also turn the spotlight on the fact that there is still much to be investigated regarding how second language use and learning is connected to interactional competence (Pekarek Doehler, 2010), as well as how learning can be considered a social phenomenon without studying changes in the use of CA phenomena, but instead consider the learning object as emically co-constructed.

The units of analysis in studies on changes in structural-sequential phenomena are independent of content and context, and the learning objects are, thus, externally and theoretically defined (e.g., doing requests, repair practices, or turn-taking). The studied phenomena are treated as stable and independent of their content and context. The emic participant's perspective is not pursued in the analysis when the analyst determines the object

of development or learning beforehand. Firth and Wagner's critical examination of the field of SLA (1997, p. 757) calls for "a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use". In other words, they criticized the traditional field of SLA for not taking into consideration the context in which the language learning and language use took place. The learning objects were theoretically and externally defined, and the language use and learning were treated as stable and independent of the local context. Firth and Wagner's criticism was well received by some of the SLA community, and context sensitivity coincides well with CA's interests, which lie in social actions and do not treat language as an autonomous sovereign system independent of the context in which it is used (Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). Instead, language use (e.g., grammar and word choice) is treated as a set of resources that participants "deploy, monitor, interpret and manipulate" (Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olshe, 2002, p. 15) as they perform various social acts and maintain intersubjectivity. The context and situation in which the social interaction is conducted in is an important part of the analysis in CA. For example, Lee and Hellermann (2014) address this issue in their proposed forms of analyses of both cross-sectional and longitudinal data in EFL settings. They argue that CA can, through its understanding of the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction, identify the process by which changes in second language forms and functions are caused in the situated context of the second language use. They conclude that, "What matters here is not just the presence of linguistic changes, but the contingent methods L2 speakers deploy in contextually occasioned language use" (Lee & Hellermann, 2014, p. 763).

Another issue concerning the analysis of one or several CA phenomena as independent of the context is that the contingency of the social interaction is not taken into account. It may be counterproductive to analyze, for example, repair sequences as independent of the context they are enacted in (e.g., Lee, 2010). A situation—context—in which one form of repair is used may not be the same as another. CA, as an analytical method, strives to analyze the social organization "through a reliance on case-by-case analysis leading to generalizations across cases but without allowing them to congeal into an aggregate" (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012, p. 2). In other words, CA analyses involve collections of cases to describe and explain the more generic properties of particular practices, but this is still done without ever losing accountability to each single case and its unique particularities, such as its particular group of participants that use specific wording to accomplish locally relevant outcomes (Sidnell, 2012a). Lee (2010) argues, in his article on how CA can be used in research on second language learning that if one wants to study learning from an emic participant's perspective, the contingency of social interaction has to be central in the study. Talk-in-interaction changes turn-by-turn, which is too contingent to define the learning objects theoretically and externally (Lee, 2010; Sahlström, 2009). Instead, one

should rely on one of CA's pillars, the emic participant's perspective, and consider the learning object as something that participants actively orient to, and consider learning as social action they demonstrably and explicitly do when engaged in social interaction (Lee, 2010). In other words, learning would then be pursued as something that is visible, observable, and available for analysis. With an emic participant's perspective, the analysis may be able to recover practices that participants use to do learning.

Throughout the past two decades, CA studies on second language learning that have focused on the social organization of educational institutions and/or changes in participants' uses of structural-sequential phenomena over time have contributed greatly to the understanding of second language learning in interaction. However, neither group of studies have approached learning as something that can be discovered and described using CA. In other words, an attempt to describe and explain learning as social action that is conceptualized within CA has been sidelined. As Sahlström (2009, p. 109) mentions, "it is necessary for CA to have a more developed perspective on change, development, and learning, if the ambitious claims of being an independent discipline of human sociality are to be sustained." One way to move forward in this direction is to understand and analyze learning as an emic category—social action—that participants demonstrably orient to and do in the social interaction (cf. Gardner, 2012).

The present thesis is an attempt to respond to this gap. It is positioned in a small, albeit growing, field of CA studies on learning that consider learning as social action (e.g., Lee, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Melander, 2012a; Melander, 2012b; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk, Pörn, & Sahlström, 2016; Rusk, Sahlström & Pörn, accepted; Sahlström, 2009; Sahlström, 2011; Wagner, 2010). Departing from a social-interactional view on learning, these studies explore new ways of understanding how learning can be considered as social action; something participants demonstrably and explicitly do in the contingency of human talk-in-interaction. Learning as social action, or doing learning, is analyzed by considering the object of learning as something that participants actively orient to as an emergent, shared, pedagogical focus that is locally established, co-constructed, and is an emically relevant part of the situated activities (Lee, 2010; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Sahlström, 2011). In other words, learning and the object(s) of learning are approached from an emic participant's perspective: they are not externally or theoretically defined as ready-made analytical categories. Whether learning is done (as action) or not, and whether participants orient to the practices as learning or not, is an empirical question that can be answered by analyzing how participants orient to the situated context and local practices. Lilja (2014), for example, shows in her analysis of conversations between first and second language speakers that the interactionally co-constructed roles of second language user and second language learner are two emically and analytically separate entities. In the analysis, she shows

how participants make the different roles locally relevant depending on the contingency of the interaction. It is relevant for the analyst to keep the concepts separate. Hence, learning is viewed as social action constructed in the social interaction by participants as they achieve a locally relevant outcome in concert with each other.

CA research on learning as social action draws strongly upon emerging CA research on the multitude of ways in which the management of knowledge is utilized as a resource in interaction (e.g., Du Bois, 2007; Goodwin, 2013; Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Stivers et al., 2011). The management of knowledge in social interaction is an omnipresent part of the interactional organization of human sociality according to the growing body of CA research on epistemics in social interaction (e.g., Clift, 2012; Drew, 2012; Heritage, 2012a; Heritage, 2012b; Sidnell, 2012b). Epistemics, knowing, and the dynamic relationships between participants' knowledge also seem to be integral and important parts of practices that participants orient to as doing learning (Lilja, 2014; Melander & Sahlström, 2010; Melander, 2012a; Melander, 2012b; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk et al., 2016; Rusk, Sahlström & Pörn, accepted; Sahlström, 2011; Tanner, 2014). What one knows, how one knows something, and what one expect others to know are important issues in classrooms and teaching/learning situations. Knowledge asymmetries and claims of knowledge are often actualized in the interaction between teacher and student. Participants' expressed knowing in relation to different domains of knowledge can be used as a resource by teachers and students when determining whether someone has understood or not and to determine what someone has learned or needs to learn. The roles of teacher and student are not (necessarily) predefined. They are made relevant and talked into being by participants in the social interaction, in the same way as participants co-construct the roles of second language user and second language learner (cf. Lilja, 2014). This negotiation involves the management of knowledge between participants and in relation to different domains of knowledge (e.g., Melander & Sahlström, 2010).

Sahlström (2011) presents empirical evidence of two 7-year-old girls doing language learning outside of the classroom. The participants' oriented-to learning object in the social interaction is how to count in English (from one to ten). The results conclude that the four situations where the girls are doing learning and are orienting towards learning to count in English are characterized by (1) an oriented-to longitudinality, (2) oriented-to knowledge asymmetries, and (3) expressed epistemic stances (Sahlström, 2011). In other words, the participants (1) achieve an understanding of the situationally oriented-to learning object as something they have done learning on previously and/or on which they will be doing learning in the future. The participants also (2) negotiate the dynamic epistemic relationships between them in relation to each other and the learning object. Furthermore, they do it by (3) expressing their own and attending to each others' epis-

temic stances (public displays of knowledge). All three characteristics that Sahlström (2011) identifies as frequent in situations in which participants orient to their mutual activities as doing learning involve epistemics, that is, expressed knowledge and knowing in relation to each other and the oriented-to learning object. Epistemics can, thus, be considered a crucial part of doing learning and second language learning in interaction.

### 3. Epistemics in interaction

As mentioned before, epistemics is recognized as an important aspect of doing learning (Melander & Sahlström, 2010; Melander, 2012a; Melander, 2012b; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk, Pörn & Sahlström, 2016; Rusk, Sahlström & Pörn, accepted; Sahlström, 2011; Tanner, 2014) and the body of studies employing CA's analysis of epistemics in interaction is ever growing, including studies on learning and second language learning (e.g. Jakonen, 2014a; Jakonen, 2014b; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Koole, 2010; Kääntä, 2014; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Sert, 2013; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). In this chapter, I will provide a brief overview of the field of epistemics in interaction within CA and I conclude the section with a discussion on how an analytical focus on epistemics can help to better understand second language learning as social action.

Epistemics and knowledge as displayed in the unfolding talk-in-interaction have been studied in CA since the beginning of the field (Schegloff, 2010), however it was not until the 2010s (e.g., Goodwin, 2013; Stivers et al., 2011) and especially after the groundbreaking articles by Heritage (2012b; 2012c; 2012d) that the field grew rapidly and epistemics became part of CA studies and referred to with the notions of epistemic status and stance. In the articles, Heritage provides a first attempt to systematically map epistemics within the framework of CA (Sidnell, 2012b). This section is dedicated to epistemic status and stance, as well as the notions of epistemic congruency, balance, and discrepancy that describe the interplay between status and stance. These open up the possibility to discover a broad range of interactional phenomena that would otherwise have remained invisible (Sidnell, 2012b). The chapter concludes with a discussion on how the epistemics framework can benefit the investigation of second language learning as social action.

#### 3.1. Epistemic status and stance

Epistemics in interaction are integral parts of the next turn proof procedure (Sacks & Schegloff, 1974), the socially shared cognition (Kasper, 2009; Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010), and the social organization of epistemic ecologies (Goodwin, 2013). Mutual action and understanding rest largely on participants' abilities to acknowledge what co-participants know or do not know regarding a specific epistemic domain and adjust actions accordingly (cf. Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Garfinkel, 1967; Goodwin, 1986; Mead, 1934; Schütz, 1962). In the organization of dynamic epistemic relationships in social interaction, participants orient to each other's epistemic statuses, which are expressed in the moment-by-moment interaction through epistemic stances encoded in the talk-in-interaction (Heritage, 2012b; Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012a; Heritage, 2012d; Stivers et al., 2011).



Epistemic status is a participant's epistemic access to a domain of knowledge, an epistemic domain, distributed between participants in interaction so that they occupy more knowledgeable (K+) or less knowledgeable (K-) positions in relation to the domain and each other (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d). However, this knowing and knowledge is rarely, if ever, absolute and the positions are not either or. In other words, a participant is not altogether unknowing or knowing regarding an epistemic domain. The "real" state of these knowledge asymmetries is usually closer to the fact that participants occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient in relation to each other for different epistemic domains (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d).

Epistemic status is drawn from the notion that any two participants have their own areas of information—territories of knowledge—and that any knowledge can land into both, albeit to different degrees. Epistemic status has four distinguished features (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d): (1) it is inherently relative to one or more co-participants, (2) it varies by epistemic domain(s) and over time, (3) it can be based in experience and/or social rights to that epistemic domain, and (4) it can be considered a somewhat stable feature of social relationships and social interaction. Even though it is to a certain extent a settled matter, the epistemic status of each participant vis-à-vis an epistemic domain can be altered and/or challenged from moment-to-moment, as an outcome of interactional contributions (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d). Knowledge that is oriented to is displayed and emergent in-and-through the participants' talk-in-interaction. Knowledge is not a fixed status. Instead, it is a dynamic process that is negotiated in the interaction between the participants (Mondada, 2011a). As Heritage (2012a, p. 377) explains:

In sum, epistemic status embraces what is known, how it is known (through what method, with what degree of definiteness, certainty, recency, etc.) and persons' rights, responsibilities and obligations to know it.

Epistemic stance is a more established notion in CA research on epistemics in interaction, and it concerns the expressions of dynamic epistemic relationships with regard to epistemic domains on a moment-by-moment basis (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d). Epistemic stance is, largely, an expressed reflection of the speaker's epistemic status regarding the currently oriented-to epistemic domain and the co-participants. It is a co-constructed and intersubjective activity that is emergent in the temporal unfolding of the social interaction (see also, e.g., Du Bois, 2007; Karlsson, 2006; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Linell, 2009). In other words, epistemic stance is managed through the designs of turns-at-talk and a person can claim different positions on an epistemic gradient towards an epistemic domain, that is, a relatively knowing and/or a relatively unknowing stance. Stance is achieved, co-constructed and dialogical in that a participant's stance is always compared and contrast-

ed to both the oriented-to epistemic domain and to relevant co-participants' knowledge and expressed stances of the said domain (e.g., Jaffe, 2009).

### **3.2. The interplay between status and stance: congruence, balance and discrepancy**

In this section, I elaborate on three areas of investigation within the field of CA research on epistemics. The first two—epistemic congruence and epistemic balance—are what can be considered part of what “drives sequences”. They appear to be part of the foundation of social interaction and conversation. According to Heritage they are “the grist for the interaction mill” (Heritage, 2012d, p. 48). The third—epistemic discrepancy—is a smaller area of investigation. It is, nonetheless, important to understand when investigating participants' management of knowledge in complex epistemic circumstances, such as the bilingual second language educational settings investigated in the present thesis.

Epistemic congruence is expressed, on one hand, when a participant's expressed epistemic stance is compatible with their epistemic status relative to an epistemic domain and, on the other hand, when the expressed status is congruent with that of the co-participant (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d). Epistemic congruence is, in other words, an intersubjective fact that is achieved in the unfolding of the social interaction (Heritage, 2013). It refers to participants' mutual understanding of own and other's knowledge (what one knows and what others know) and it stretches over several turns or even entire sequences (Heritage, 2012a). Participants usually maintain consistency between the epistemic status and stance they encode in their turns-at-talk. For example, relatively K- speakers ask questions and relatively K+ speakers make assertions (Heritage, 2013). However, epistemic stances encoded in turns-at-talk can also be incongruent for a variety of motives and contingencies, and participants who wish to seem more or less knowledgeable than they are may dissemble their epistemic status (e.g., Drew, 2012; Heinemann, Steensig, & Lindström, 2011; Heritage, 2013; Raymond & Heritage, 2006). In some situations an incongruent stance may even be essential for the interaction to run smoothly (Heritage, 2013; Raymond & Heritage, 2006). The typical exam questions (known-answer questions) that play an important part in the dynamic epistemic relationships in classrooms (e.g., Gardner, 2012; Markee, 2004; Margutti, 2010) are generally incongruent (Drew, 2012). The management of epistemic congruence and the epistemic status of a participant appear to be central pragmatical resources that participants orient to when determining whether an utterance is requesting or asserting information, and the linguistic design of the utterance seems to be trumped by this (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2013).

There also appears to be a propensity towards achieving epistemic balance in human social interaction (Drew, 2012; Heritage, 2012a). The moti-

vation for a response to a question seems to be partly found in the “principle of epistemic balance” (Drew, 2012, p. 65). Epistemic imbalances may be used by participants to warrant new conversational contributions and the sequence or topic is closed when participants mutually agree that an adequate epistemic balance is reached (Heritage, 2012a). Heritage (e.g., 2012a) calls this an “epistemic seesaw” and both knowing and unknowing epistemic stances may drive sequences forward through an initiation or expansion. There are (at least) three means of sequence closings (Heritage, 2012a, pp. 390–391): (1) the use of sequence closing thirds (Schegloff, 2007) such as change-of-state-tokens (Heritage, 1984b; Lindström, 2008), (2) the use of idiomatic expressions (Drew & Holt, 1988) and (3) patterns of topic attritions in which no participant adds any significant new information to the sequence (Jefferson, 1981). In other words, the seesaw may be halted by different practices. Consequently, the active sequence “dies” to make way for a “new” sequence when participants mutually agree that a situationally adequate epistemic balance has been reached. There will, in other words, always be relative epistemic imbalances between participants. But these imbalances are usually momentary, since the aim of participants engaged in mutual action and interaction appears to be to arrive at some kind of mutually acceptable “epistemic equilibrium” (Drew, 2012, p. 62) regarding the locally oriented-to epistemic domains. Epistemic balance cannot be predefined by the participants or analyst, as the agreement on a reached adequate epistemic balance is co-constructed and emergent in the social interaction. Participants can agree that an adequate epistemic balance has been reached (emically), even though a “true” balance or shared understanding may not have been achieved (etically; see, e.g., Rusk et al., 2016).

The third notion that describes the interplay between epistemic status and stance is epistemic discrepancy. A discrepancy is a surprising lack of compatibility (or similarity) between two or more aspects. An epistemic discrepancy is, then, a lack of compatibility between two (or more) co-participants’ understanding and/or knowledge of each others’ understanding and/or knowledge of a specific epistemic domain (Mondada, 2011a; Heritage, 2012a; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). In other words, an epistemic discrepancy describes participants’ differing expectations regarding what they and others know. The analysis of epistemic discrepancies highlights some issues regarding the epistemic gradient in the analysis. Epistemic status is not always suited to be analyzed from a perspective of it as a single gradient. Instead, it may be a much more complicated “map”, such as a topographical map (cf. Schütz, 1964; Sidnell, 2012b). In some cases, participants may have unmediated access to the phenomenon that is talked about, but the access may differ (depending on previous experiences, expertise, etc.). Heritage (2012c, p. 5) writes, “Complex and difficult epistemic circumstances can be created when incommensurate epistemic resources are in conflict.” Epistemic discrepancies can emerge in situations and epistemic circumstances in

which the object of knowledge is not of simultaneous experience, but in which many other epistemic factors (recency of the knowledge, its origin, reliability, intelligibility, and rights and obligations to the knowledge, etc.) come to play (e.g. Heritage, 2012c; Stivers et al., 2011). These epistemic discrepancies are unavoidably present in some domains that involve some kind of expertise in knowledge, such as medicine (Heritage, 2012a). Classrooms could also be classified as settings in which epistemic discrepancies may be unavoidably present. Even though a teacher may show in the book and explain how to read a map, this does not mean that the student has seen and understood it in the same way (Tanner, 2014). In other words, something that is perfectly observable and to which both participants have unmediated access to, may still not be clear and understandable to one party of the interaction. The bilingual settings investigated in the present study also involve epistemic discrepancies—complex epistemic circumstances—mainly because of differing expectations regarding language knowledge that may emerge in the social interaction. These expectations of language knowledge may lead to extensive epistemic discrepancies between participants.

An example<sup>4</sup>, excerpt (1), will be used to exemplify how epistemic status and stance can be analyzed from the perspective of the present thesis. The excerpt is from a Finnish as second language classroom. The situation is from a larger collection of video recordings at a communicative second language program for seven-year-old children where the second language is Finnish (see section 5.1). The children's mother tongue is Swedish. The teacher is bilingual and knows both Finnish and Swedish, but the teacher's main language of instruction is Finnish. In excerpt (1), the teacher gives instructions for the next activity and assigns roles to the children. The child, Erik, is assigned the role of "poro" (reindeer, line 1). He then asks what it is (line 3). The teacher responds to his expressed unknowing stance with a counter (Markee, 2004; Markee, 1995; Schegloff, 2007), by asking Erik "mikä oli poro" (what was reindeer). The teacher has an institutionally sanctioned status as K+ regarding the content and the second language (Finnish), and Erik's is in relation K- (Sidnell, 2012b). The participants orient to and make these statuses locally relevant in the unfolding interaction. Erik expresses a strong unknowing stance on line 3, hence, orienting to the teacher as relatively K+ regarding second language knowledge and knowledge of what "poro" (reindeer) means. By doing this he orients to himself as relatively K-with regard to knowing what "poro" (reindeer) is. He expresses an epistemic imbalance between his knowledge of what "poro" (reindeer) is in relation to the teacher. Erik's management of his own status and the teacher's is

---

4 The Finnish translation is in italics and the Swedish translation is in bold. The translation of the transcripts is not idiomatic. They are instead an attempt to replicate the wording, prosody and way of speaking used by the participants in the situations transcribed but still give the reader a good understanding of what is said. (see, e.g., Bucholtz, 2000; Temple & Young, 2004)

(1) poro\_15\_181208\_23.41-24.00

01 T: Erik on poro (0.4) Elin on poro  
*Erik is a reindeer Elin is a reindeer*  
02 ((points at Erik)) ((points at Elin))  
03 E: va e de  
**what is it**

-> 04 T: mikä oli poro  
*what was reindeer*

05 E: °ren.°  
°reindeer.°

06 T: jää. ( ) poro (.) poro  
*yes. ( ) reindeer reindeer*  
((points at children))

*Excerpt (1). Poro.*

congruent (relatively K- participants ask questions). But instead of providing the answer for Erik, which is usually the case in similar situations in ordinary conversation, the teacher counters Erik's question with an incongruent interrogative. The teacher encodes an incongruent unknowing stance in her turn on line 4 as she counters, and in that way projects Erik as possibly knowing what "poro" (reindeer) is (line 4). Erik responds, correctly, in a soft voice "ren" (reindeer, line 5), thus, expressing himself as K+ regarding the knowledge of what "poro" means. However, the encoded knowing stance is weak (on the epistemic gradient), which is indicated by him using a soft, insecure voice. The turn on line 6, in which the teacher confirms the correctness of Erik's answer, reasserts the K+ epistemic status of the teacher (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Drew, 1981). She has the epistemic authority, an institutionally sanctioned K+ status, to confirm his answer (e.g., Sidnell, 2012b; Stivers et al., 2011). The participants, thus, close the sequence as they mutually agree on having reached an adequate epistemic balance (e.g., Heritage, 2012d).

### 3.3. Epistemics as a relevant part of doing second language learning

Epistemics in interaction involves considering knowledge as an aspect of interactional activities and it may seem that the notions epistemic status and epistemic stance introduce contingencies that are hard to deal with in studies on interaction. In fact, this is not the case as participants often actively embody, act upon, and orient to the statuses and stances at play in the contexts and situations that they are in. Participants also, in most cases, treat epistemic issues as resolved and settled. For instance, people are gen-

erally treated as having more knowledge than others about domains close to them, such as their relatives, friends, jobs, and hobbies. Also, persons in different roles of expertise in institutional settings are usually oriented-to as having more knowledge regarding their areas of expertise (e.g., Heritage, 2012c). If epistemic disputes arise, these are often solved in-and-through socially sanctioned ways. For example, recent experience and external expertise is privileged over less-recent experience and amateurs' knowledge (e.g., Heritage, 2012c; Pollner, 1975; Pollner, 1974). It is the teacher who, in the context of the second language classroom, occupies the epistemic status of relatively more knowledgeable regarding both content and language. The teacher's status is seldom challenged regarding these epistemic domains. The student's epistemic status regarding content and language is relatively less knowledgeable than the teacher, whereas the epistemic statuses between students regarding same epistemic domains, and each other, are often subject to negotiation and dependent on the context: especially regarding the language used, the second language, and the content.

Participants need certain background knowledge to be able to conduct and mutually do second language learning. As Goodwin (2013, p. 8) explains regarding epistemic ecologies:

Through the progressive development of, and apprenticeship within, diverse epistemic ecologies, communities invest their members with the resources required to understand each other in just the ways that make possible the accomplishment of ongoing, situated action.

That is, settings are often structured for a public organization of knowledge and in that organization participants express expectations and responsibilities regarding their own and others' knowledge. Certain knowledge may also be hidden from specific participants. These arrangements are not restricted to individuals, but to several participants' local, public, and relevant knowledge states, which are linked together in-and-through mutual actions (Goodwin, 2013). In other words, how epistemic relationships are managed in everyday conversations may not be immediately applicable to educational settings (e.g., Jakonen, 2014a; Koole, 2012; Kääntä, 2014; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). For example, the expectations of the membership categories regarding knowledge of the second language—which are at play in the second language classroom—support that the student (K-) is entitled to receive help and support and the teacher (K+) is morally and contractually obligated to provide support and instruction (Mondada, 2011a). This is partly how the community of the second language classroom provides resources for its members to be able to do second language learning in concert with each other. In the context of second language classrooms, the teacher uses the second language to provide these resources. However, bilingual and second language educational settings can be considered complex epistemic circumstances in which both participants may have access to the oriented-to knowledge, but in which the access may differ due to epistemic factors

(language, recency of the knowledge, its origin, reliability, intelligibility, and rights and obligations to the knowledge) that come to play.

The teacher has the institutional authority to support members in the classroom (students) and provide students with resources in order that all parties achieve a shared understanding of their joint activities. This may, nevertheless, be an interactionally complicated task because of the complex epistemic circumstances that are at play in the second language classroom. This is one of the reasons why many CA studies on classrooms focus on teachers' and students' repair and correction practices (e.g., Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Kääntä, 2010; Macbeth, 2004; Markee, 2000; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong, 2000). Repair is a set of practices through which the ongoing activity is interrupted to attend to trouble(s) in the shared understanding. Repair practices are used by participants in interaction to maintain and/or restore intersubjectivity so that the ongoing activity can progress (see, e.g., Schegloff, 2007). Some studies on repair practices in second language classrooms make a distinction between repair and correction (see, e.g., Kääntä, 2010 or MacBeth 2004 for a thorough review on the issue). That is, whether there is a difference between repair and correction, for example, when teachers initiate repair in the next turn after a student's trouble source, it is not repair, it is correction (McHoul, 1990, pp. 374). The student's answer contains an error that is corrected. These corrections can also be self-initiated and self-corrected. However, the point is that it is correction—not repair—when an erroneous item is substituted with a correct one. Several scholars have problematized this view on repair and correction in second language educational settings (e.g., Hall, 2007; Koshik, 2002; Seedhouse, 2007). This thesis is not the place for a thorough review of the issue. However, I will clarify my stance on the relationship between repair and correction, as some practices that are investigated in the studies of this thesis are closely related to repair and correction, although with a different analytical framework: the epistemics framework.

In this thesis, I employ a perspective on repair and correction similar to Seedhouse (2007). This implies that there are two strands of CA with regards to the issue, linguistic CA, and ethnomethodological CA. The former uses an etic approach to the analysis, thus, using a ready-made definition of repair and correction in the analysis, whereas the latter advocates an emic approach to the analysis (Hall, 2007; Seedhouse, 2007). In this thesis, I employ an ethnomethodological and, thus, emic approach to the phenomenon of repair, which involves an emic participant's perspective on how participants orient to and make relevant the use of repair as an interactional resource in the investigated second language educational settings. However, I approach these meaning-making practices in-and-through another analytical framework: the epistemics framework.

Repair, understanding, and questions appear to be the business of the talk-in-interaction in pedagogical contexts like the second language class-

room (e.g., Kitzinger, 2012; Macbeth, 2004; Schegloff et al., 2002). Repair practices (e.g., IRE) are part of the building blocks that constitute the second language classroom as an institution. That is, they are part of the institutional practices in the classroom (cf. Hayano, 2012; Schegloff et al., 2002). CA research on repair practices in classrooms is extensive, thanks to which we now better understand the subtleties of the interactional architecture of classrooms. However, for analyzing learning as social action the analyst could benefit further from using the epistemics framework. The epistemics framework provides the analyst tools to better differentiate practices that participants appear to orient to as second language learning from repair practices in terms of Schegloff's (2000) definition<sup>5</sup>, since "overtly pedagogical settings are not necessarily the most inviting settings, or the most relevant ones, for the application of conversation-analytic work on repair" (Schegloff et al., 2002, p. 8). Another reason for using the epistemics framework in the present thesis is because all repair that is done in classrooms do not seem to be associated with problems of hearing, speaking, or understanding "the talk" (cf. Schegloff, 2000, p. 207). The epistemics framework may help better differentiate and discover the situations and practices when participants are actively oriented to doing second language learning. These situations may or may not involve operations of repair. Hence, instead of merely orienting to practices as repair, the analysis can better discover when and how participants orient to the locally relevant practices as second language learning.

---

5 "By 'repair' we refer to practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation (and in other forms of talk-in-interaction, for that matter). I want to underscore the phrase 'the talk' in my reference to 'problems in understanding the talk'; for we did not mean to include within the scope of 'repair' all practices addressed to problems of understanding (like understanding exactly how the Internet works), only the narrower domain of 'understanding what someone has just said'-though there can on occasion be only a fuzzy boundary between these." (Schegloff, 2000, p. 207)



## 4. On (some) methodological positions and the basic analytic method of conversation analysis

In this chapter, I will describe and review the main method employed in the present study to analyze and study second language learning as social action, namely, conversation analysis (CA). My intention is not to provide a complete review of the field of CA. Instead I aim to present core methodological principles of CA that are relevant for this project.

CA is an exploring and “discovering science”, that is, the aim is the discovery of regularities of human social interaction that have previously remained unknown (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a). Sidnell (2012a) and Schegloff (1996) describe this work as that of a cartographer in the 18th Century who maps the globe. The conversation analyst “maps” and describes the interactional phenomena, in addition to identifying them. To achieve this, and to carefully map human social organization, CA provides the analyst with a set of methods and techniques for analysis that distinguish CA from other disciplines within the social sciences that also study language use and social interaction with the help of recordings of naturally occurring interaction (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). I will point out five aspects that are distinctive to CA and CA’s methodological contribution to studies in and on social interaction (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012): (1) the theoretical assumption of “order at all points” in human social interaction, (2) focus on talk as action, (3) data construction, (4) transcription system, and (5) inductive methods of analysis.

The first aspect involves the assumption that social interaction is made possible because participants share certain communicative competencies that include knowledge of the structures and norms that concern the organization of social action. This knowledge is something that participants are generally not aware of at a conscious level. It is, nonetheless, salient to participants as they establish and maintain a mutual understanding—intersubjectivity—of what they are saying and doing when engaged in joint activities. CA attempts to discover these fundamental sense-making practices that make coherent social action possible between participants (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). In other words, CA is empirically developing Goffman’s (1983) argument of an institutional order of interaction (Drew & Heritage, 2006).

The second distinctive aspect of CA is that the aim of the analysis in CA is action-focused. The goal of the analysis is to discover the practices that participants employ to produce and understand conduct in social interaction, and make them explicit (Drew & Heritage, 2006). Any feature of a turn in a sequence that is specifically situated, recurrent, and that attracts distinctive responses, which distinguish it from related or similar conduct can be identified as a practice (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a). A

central feature for a practice to be effective is that the social action intended by the speaker must be recognizable to recipients. The analysis of practices to perform different social actions can be validated by examining the recipients' responses—the next turn proof procedure (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sacks & Schegloff, 1974; Sidnell, 2012a). Every contribution (e.g. turn, utterance) to the interaction is situated in the context, shaped by the context, and renews the context (Seedhouse, 2004). The precedent turn/action makes a next turn/action relevant (e.g., greeting-greeting, question-answer, invitation-acceptance/rejection). The series of turns, the sequence, can be tracked for what participants may be doing in-and-through them, which responses may be relevant or possible, and where the sequence is going. In other words, what interactional outcomes—social actions—participants are pursuing (Schegloff, 2007).

To be able to achieve these aims, the data needs to be recordings of natural activities (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). CA's naturalistic and emic perspective motivates the use of unedited recordings (usually video or audio recordings) of naturally occurring social interaction (Mondada, 2012b), rather than edited recordings or recordings of experimental settings. All stages of the data construction (e.g., recordings, selection, and transcription) and all decisions made at every stage of the data construction are part of the analysis. The researcher “constructs” the data when making choices in each stage of data construction, hence the term data construction (Rusk et al., 2014). The relation between data construction and analysis is an important issue to recognize, since different data construction facilitates specific forms of analysis and understandings of the investigated phenomena. The explication of this chain of data construction, analysis, and results must be addressed already in the beginning stages of the data construction (e.g., Rusk et al., 2014).

CA is engaged in analyzing the fine-grained details of interaction, which is why recorded data is not usually analyzed in its raw form or coded according to external, ready-made categories. Instead data is prepared through rigorously detailed transcription to capture the micro-genetic details of social interaction for analysis (e.g., Hepburn & Bolden, 2012). Jefferson (2004) developed ways of representing talk and other non-verbal/embodied conduct in social interaction, including the richness in the delivery of the talk-in-interaction (intonation, stress, etc). The transcripts in CA need to have enough detail on the social interaction to facilitate the discovery and description of the orderly conduct of social actions in interaction (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012, see more on transcription in section 5.5).

The fifth, and final, aspect that makes CA distinctive is its inductive methods of analysis. CA strongly relates talk and other social conduct to the local social context in which the talk-in-interaction is produced, recognized, and understood. The approach to social context that CA employs is distinctive, because “the 'context' of an interaction cannot be exhaustively defined by the analyst a priori; rather, participants display their sense of rel-

evant context in the particular ways in which they design their talk – that is, in the recipient design of their talk” (Drew & Heritage, 2006, p. XXVI). Therefore, the analysis is inductive and the focus of the analysis is on what participants do at that particular time, in that particular situation, and with those particular co-participants. The analysis is therefore grounded in an emic participant’s perspective, that is, how participants understand actions in the interaction. The analysis is not done by deconstructing ready-made classes or externally defined categories, since these cannot—according to the analytical method of CA—completely be defined or described by the analyst beforehand (e.g., Schegloff, 2007). Also, CA is concerned with the interactional organization that, although perfectly visible, observable, and available for formal description (thanks to recordings of it), seems to exist below the immediate conscious awareness of the average person (Sidnell, 2012a). That is why CA cannot rely on members’ claims and testimony about this interactional organization. Therefore, instead of applying a priori categories or interviewing the participants on the interactional organization, CA examines what participants actually do. In other words, the evidence that is used to construct an analysis in CA regarding what some specific conduct is doing is located in the data itself.

The basic analytic premise of CA is summed up by Schegloff (1999, p. 581) in the following quote on how an analyst, using CA, discovers phenomena of interest:

For whatever naturally occurring setting in the world turns out to be engaging, observing it carefully, closely, seriously, open-mindedly; observing – over and over again – to find what the natural world may be ‘telling you’ that you did not know before, that you had not thought about that way before, that you had not entertained before – rather than to find which thing you already know this is a version of, so that you can align with it or choose the critique to aim at it.

The basic premise of a CA study is that the analyst should let the data do the talking and construct the analysis based on the empirical findings in the data itself. CA’s analytical evidence is data-internal. The analytic procedure, in its most basic form, involves four steps. It begins with the analyst (1) identifying a phenomenon, noticing a distinctive feature of behavior in social interaction. This first step, which is what Schegloff refers to in the quote, is a controversial one (see, e.g., Billig, 1999a; Billig, 1999b). The analyst is supposed to identify the phenomenon of interest through, for want of a better term, “unmotivated looking.” Paradoxically, to look is always motivated, otherwise there would be no looking (Psathas, 1995; Seedhouse, 2004). However, unmotivated looking is still a critically important site of origin for a lot of the most important and genuinely innovative and new CA work (Schegloff, 1999, pp. 577–578). As Schegloff (1999, p. 578) states:

A key component in the training and progressive competence of new CA workers is the developing capacity to make unmotivated observations,

and to articulate them – even in the absence of any compelling upshot at that moment.

The analyst should strive for as much open-mindedness as possible in this stage, that is, to not become restricted by the “already known” (e.g. preconceived notions of macro-social structures or categories of, for example, race and/or gender) and take those already known parameters as established and inevitably relevant (Schegloff, 1999). In other words, the analyst is to adopt a CA perspective—an emic participant’s perspective—and be open to discovering new phenomena instead of searching through data with preconceived notions, hypotheses or externally defined categories (Seedhouse, 2004). None of the phenomena analyzed in the studies of this thesis have been discovered from a preconception that they were issues I wanted to find. Instead, they were, and became, emergent in the data as a result of repeated unmotivated looking. For example, the practices that are analyzed as participants doing second language learning were not predefined before the initial analysis, that is, the unmotivated looking.

Following the unmotivated observations, the analyst needs to conduct an inductive search through the database and (2) collect multiple similar instances of said phenomenon and (3) identify a specific criterion for the collection to be able to compare all instances with this criterion. The last step is to (4) describe and identify the differences between instances of the phenomenon (Seedhouse, 2004; Sidnell, 2010). Similar to the use of other qualitative research methods, the procedure described above is not to be considered a formula or a list that can be applied step-wise in a mechanical fashion (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 13). Instead, it is more essential to adopt the core methodological aspects of CA by assuming a CA mentality which “involves more a cast of mind, or a way of seeing, than a static and prescriptive set of instructions which analysts bring to bear on the data” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 94). One way of doing this is to, in-and-through all the stages of the analysis, attempt to answer the essential question “Why that, in that way, right now?” This tripartite question concisely highlights that interaction is viewed as action (why that) that is performed and expressed in diverse linguistic forms (in that way) in a specific, locally situated sequence (right now, Seedhouse, 2004, p. 16).

The analytic method of CA requires the analyst to move back-and-forth between the micro-analysis of some specific cases and the holistic analysis of the collection, which specific cases are part of and comprise (Sidnell, 2012a). Because of CA’s context-sensitive analytical methods and theoretical assumptions regarding the orderliness of social interaction, all and any of the particular cases in a collection of instances of a practice or phenomenon are unique. Therefore, the analyst must, in order to be able to discern the generic features of a practice or phenomenon, collect multiple instances of said practice or phenomenon (Sidnell, 2012a). These instances of data will include, necessarily, both the speaker’s talk and conduct (the practice or

phenomenon of interest) and the recipient's understanding of the speaker's conduct. It is here that the evidence used to construct an analysis regarding what a bit of conduct is doing can be located: in the data itself in the form of the recipient's response to the conduct (the next turn proof procedure, Sacks & Schegloff, 1974). The analyst can use the recipient's response and understanding of the speaker's conduct, the uptake, to empirically ground the analysis of what the speaker was doing (or intended to do) as s/he produced that turn. Additionally, the absence of a response by the recipient or a response that had not been predicted by the speaker (the prior turn) should be part of the collection. These instances are called deviant cases. According to Sidnell (2012a) these cases actually provide the strongest evidence for the analysis, since it is in the deviant cases that the participants display most clearly their own orientations to normative interactional structures. These are the two basic forms of data-internal evidence used in the analytic method of CA. There are many more forms of evidence. However, this thesis is not the place for a thorough review. See, for example, Wootton (1989) and Sidnell (2010, pp. 59–63; 2012a) for further discussions on analytical evidence used in CA.

The analytical tools of CA, its understanding of social interaction as contextual, systematic, structured, the emic participant's perspective, and the epistemics framework provide a better understanding of how participants manage each others' knowing. However, a problem with the application of the epistemics framework is that it may overshadow fundamental and crucial aspects of the social organization. The intention of bringing in the epistemics framework to the analyses in this thesis is not for it to overshadow the analysis of the social organization—the sequential analysis—or to exaggerate and highlight some kind of competition between participants regarding who knows what and how. Instead, the epistemics framework can be used as an extension to the rigorous sequential analysis of CA to better understand how participants can identify and orient to different learning objects—including their and other's knowledge of the locally co-constructed learning objects—and do second language learning, while simultaneously attending to practices for maintaining a shared understanding of their joint activities. This thesis does not attempt to generalize, that is, to make any general assumptions regarding how (all) participants manage epistemics in interaction. The aim is, instead, to study how specific participants appear to do second language learning through certain practices—in-and-through their knowledge management—in particular situations and with particular co-participants.

Epistemics in interaction and the dynamic epistemic relationships between participants appear to be essential parts of doing learning. What one knows, how one knows something, how to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity in complex epistemic circumstances that bilingual and second language educational settings are, and how to reach a mutually acceptable

epistemic balance are important issues in teaching and learning situations (Melander & Sahlström, 2010). The notion of epistemic status may benefit the sequential analysis of doing second language learning by giving the analyst tools to understand how utterances and expressed stances regarding epistemic domains are related to the socially displayed knowledge distribution and negotiated rights to knowledge between participants (Heritage, 2012a; 2012c). The interpretation of a co-participant's utterance builds on the "fine-grained grasp of epistemic domains and relative epistemic status within them" (Heritage, 2012c, p. 24). Epistemic status can be considered an important aspect of how participants produce and recognize social actions (Heritage, 2012a, pp. 391–392), including how participants do and recognize second language learning as social action.

To conclude, CA—as a method—is not suitable for all studies on language use or social interaction, but it is remarkably robust and rigorous when used for discovering how participants themselves interpret and act upon different social actions, including what resources (talk, embodied conduct, other semiotic resources) they make relevant as they produce and recognize a locally relevant outcome of their mutual activities (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012, p. 2). This fits well with the aim of the present thesis, which is to investigate what practices participants use to perform second language learning as social action. The thesis is an attempt to discover data-internal evidence of participants doing second language learning in their joint interactional activities.

## 5. Research contexts and data construction

In this section, I briefly present the bilingual settings in which data were recorded for the studies included in the present thesis. I will also discuss the data construction, as well as the processing—transcribing—of the video recorded data. I conclude this section with a discussion on the ethical issues arising in video studies, such as this one.

The contexts investigated in this thesis stem from three different datasets that have been video recorded in three different research projects: Finnish In- and Outside of School (2008–2011), Classroom Tandem (2012–2015), and Multilingual Learning and Identity in the Everyday Lives of Finnish Children (2006–2011). These datasets involve recordings of several participants, ages 6–17, both in- and outside of classrooms in bilingual educational settings. This is to better understand how different participants in different bilingual educational settings appear to perform and recognize similar practices as second language learning as social action. CA studies on learning, including this study are not primarily concerned with categorizing informants and making distinctions on the basis of categories, such as between children’s and adults’ learning. Hence, the reason for collecting multiple instances of similar practices in various settings is to more accurately discern the more generic properties of practices of interest in these bilingual educational settings (Sidnell, 2012a).

### 5.1. Communicative Finnish as second language program

One part of the empirical material used in Study 2 consists of video recordings from an out-of-school introductory Finnish as second language program for 7-year-old Swedish-speaking children (Pörn & Norrman, 2011; Pörn & Törni, 2010, pp. 4–9). The recordings were part of a research project: Finnish In- and Outside of School (free translation from Swedish: *Finska i och utanför skolan*, 2008–2011). The language program was initiated in 2008 and was administered outside of the school as a voluntary extra-curricular activity. The overall aim of the program was to provide children with an opportunity to learn to understand Finnish and communicate in Finnish in simple everyday situations. However, the program still adhered to the national curriculum regarding introductory Finnish education for grades 1–2 (Finnish National Board of Education, 2004). In order to provide more functional and communicative language instruction, the program applied some features of content-based language instruction (Baker, 2011; Baker & Jones, 1998): (1) the second language as the language of instruction, (2) homogeneous groups, (3) a bilingual teacher, (4) optional, (5) use of first language permitted, (6) classroom activities designed to be meaningful, authentic, and relevant for the children, and (7) based on a societal and political rationale. The teacher used the second language as the language of

instruction to give children an opportunity to learn to understand Finnish. Since the teacher was a competent bilingual (Finnish-Swedish), the children could use Swedish in their interaction with the teacher. The children had no obligation to respond in Finnish. The program was an introduction to the Finnish language and not a complete immersion and gave some children a chance to familiarize themselves with the Finnish language in a playful and communicational manner (Pörn & Törni, 2010).

The language program was organized as an extra-curricular activity for four days per week (4x45 minutes/week) during two semesters in 2008–2010 (Pörn & Norrman, 2011; Pörn & Törni, 2010, pp. 4–9). The target group was 7-year-old children who had little-to-no previous knowledge of Finnish. The children's first language was Swedish and their home and school language was mainly Swedish. However, most of them also had some beginner's knowledge of Finnish. The area in Swedish Ostrobothnia where the program was organized is characterized by its bilingualism. Nevertheless, it is still possible for both Finnish- and Swedish-speaking children to go through school without having much contact with the other national language. The majority of the population in the area report Finnish as their first language.

The data analyzed for Study 2 in this thesis amounts to approximately 12 hours of video data from the first year (2008–2009) of the language program during which the children and teacher were recorded for four separate weeks: November 2008, December 2008, February 2009, and April 2009. Data of the Finnish as second language program were recorded with one video camera and no external microphone. The recordings focused on the entire group of seven children and the teacher in order to capture the teacher's social interaction with the children in different contexts, including the children's displayed understanding and use of Finnish. The teacher was shadowed in an effort to capture situations in which the teacher interacted with the children. I did not participate in the recordings of this dataset. However, I have analyzed and transcribed the data in its entirety.

## **5.2. Classroom tandem**

Part of the data in Study 2 and 3 are video recordings of tandem dyads in classroom tandem courses conducted in Spring and Fall in 2013–2014. The recordings were part of a research project: Classroom Tandem (Swedish: *Klasstandem*, 2012–2015). An opportunity to develop and study classroom tandem arose in January 2012 when a Swedish-speaking upper-secondary school and a Finnish-speaking upper-secondary school moved into the same building creating a Finnish-Swedish bilingual campus. The schools retain their independence as two separate school systems regarding curriculum and school language; however, courses in classroom tandem (as well as other projects) were planned to improve and enable cross-linguistic cooperation. This provided an ideal backdrop for developing classroom tandem (Finnish-Swedish) at a bilingual campus in a bilingual area of Fin-



land (Swedish Ostrobothnia). In Finland, there are several adjacent Swedish-speaking and Finnish-speaking schools as well as several co-located schools, so there is a potential to develop classroom tandem for use in these bilingual learning environments.

Language learning in tandem implies that the second language is learned through interaction and reciprocal cooperation with a first language speaker of the second language. Two persons with different first languages form a tandem dyad and function in turns, both as second language learners in their second language and as language models and second language resources in their first language. The first language speaker's expert role is based on their implicit knowledge of their first language and its use (Brammerts, 2003; Brammerts & Kleppin, 2003; Karjalainen, 2011; Karjalainen, Pörn, Rusk, & Björkskog, 2013).

It is important to notice that most of the research on tandem language learning focuses almost exclusively on situations in which the second language is a foreign language. The second language is a language that the learner comes into contact with only at tandem sessions. The situation in Finland, especially in bilingual areas where both languages are used widely in society therefore differs. The significant difference between classroom tandem and other language classroom contexts, such as ordinary language instruction or content-based instruction (e.g., Content and Language Integrated Learning [CLIL]), is the presence of and interaction with a first language speaker. This implies that the interaction with other students with the same first language is not as important in classroom tandem as in regular or content-based language instruction, where other second language learners and the teacher are the primary interactional partners. Furthermore, the teacher's role in classroom tandem differs from other classroom contexts where the teacher functions as the main language model (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In classroom tandem, the teacher supports students, encouraging them to use their first language speaking partners as the second language resource. The interaction in the second language in classroom tandem is, as in content-based language instruction, both an aim and a means for learning. Interaction as a means for language learning and teaching implies that all parts of language, including grammar, are mainly learned implicitly by using them in social interaction. This is characteristic especially for immersion (Baker, 2011; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In regular language instruction, there is more explicit instruction on grammar, whereas in classroom tandem, implicit grammar learning is combined with explicit grammar instruction, that is, classroom tandem includes features of both regular and content-based instruction methods.

The data analyzed in two studies (Study 2 and 3) for the present thesis are video recordings of tandem peer dyads in four different classroom tandem courses (Spring and Fall in 2013–2014) for 16-year-old students (cf. Karjalainen et al., 2013; Rusk et al., 2016; Rusk, Sahlström & Pörn, accept-

ed). Lessons were held alternatively in Finnish and Swedish. Half of the students who participated in the tandem courses had Swedish as their first language and half had Finnish as their first language. All students were novices in their second language (Finnish and Swedish, respectively). The teachers organized students into tandem dyads and the students worked throughout the classroom tandem courses in these dyads.

The data comprise approximately 95 hours of video data from four courses that were recorded in Spring and Fall in 2013–2014. Data in Spring 2013, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014 were recorded by one researcher with one video camera. The focus of the recordings was to capture the interaction of one tandem dyad in each course. The recordings also involved the use of an external microphone, which was placed so that good quality audio of the focal tandem dyad's interaction could be captured.

The Fall 2014 data were recorded with two GoPro cameras (small, easy-to-use HD-cameras) placed on the table in front of two different tandem dyads throughout the course. This enabled one researcher to be able to record two tandem dyads during one course. The cameras were placed facing the dyads and close enough to get good audio and visual recordings of the tandem dyads' interaction. This way of recording also seemed to be less intrusive as no researcher had to be standing behind a camera for recording and no external microphone was needed. Additionally, this kind of data construction was possible because the dyads were (mostly) stationary and working at their tables. I have been involved in all stages of the data construction (planning, recording, analyses, transcription) for this dataset.

### **5.3. Multilingual seven-year-old children's everyday at school**

One part of the data in Study 3 consists of weeklong video recordings of two seven-year-old multilingual children's everyday interaction at school: Sara (recorded in 2008) and Simon (recorded in 2006). The recordings were part of a research project: Multilingual Learning and Identity in the Everyday Lives of Finnish Children (MULIE, in Swedish FLIS [Flerspråkiga barns lärande och identitet i och utanför skolan] 2006–2011). The research project aimed at understanding learning and identity-construction in the everyday lives of Finnish children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, at school, in the home, and in other everyday situations.

Sara lives in a Finnish-dominated area in Helsinki. The video recordings were made at Sara's preschool in 2008. She mainly uses Swedish with her parents. However, they also speak some Swahili and English at home. Sara attends a Swedish-speaking preschool in which the teachers use Swedish as the language of instruction. However, as a consequence of the bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) background of almost all children that attend the preschool, the children also use Finnish in their everyday. Some children choose Finnish as their common language in many peer interactions and almost all of the children use (some) Finnish words in their Swedish talk (cf.

Slotte-Lüttge, Rusk, & Sahlström, 2010; Slotte-Lüttge, Sahlström, Hummelstedt, Rusk, & Grönberg, 2010). Competence in Finnish appears to be expected among children. There is explicit emphasis on the support of Swedish in the preschool, since Finnish is used in several different contexts by the children. Swedish is regarded by teachers, as the weaker language for many children. Sara's data that were analyzed in Study 3 for the present thesis are video recordings of five entire preschool days, including post-school programs, in Spring 2008. The recordings were administered by researchers and include all interaction involving Sara at school: classrooms, breaks outside, school lunches, as well as all activities during post-school programs. (Hummelstedt, Sahlström, Forsman, Pörn & Slotte-Lüttge, 2008)

Simon lives in a bilingual area of Swedish Ostrobothnia and comes from a bilingual home: he speaks Finnish with his mother and Swedish with his father. The parents speak Swedish with each other. Simon goes to a Swedish-speaking school in which he attends a CLIL-class where the language of instruction is partly English and partly Swedish (Sjöholm & Björklund, 1999). Most children in Simon's class are from Swedish-Finnish homes, but some have linguistic backgrounds with a first language other than Swedish or Finnish. At school, Simon speaks Swedish, Finnish, and English with his peers. The data analyzed in Study 3 for the thesis include video recordings that were conducted by researchers who shadowed Simon throughout his everyday at school for one week in Fall 2006. The recordings include all interaction and activities that Simon is part of: in the classroom, at recess, during lunch, and all activities at the post-school programs (Sahlström, Pörn, & Slotte-Lüttge, 2008).

The combined data of Sara and Simon analyzed as part of Study 3 for the present thesis amounts to approximately 85 hours of video recordings of both children's everyday at preschool and school. The recordings focus on the children and their interaction partners: peers and teachers. The recordings attempt to capture the children's everyday at school from an emic perspective, that is, what the children orient to and make relevant in their situated social interaction. Sara and Simon wore wireless microphones to maximize the possibility of capturing good audio for analysis. I was involved in subsequent recordings using the same design as described above for the same research project. However, I was not involved in recording Sara and Simon. I have, nevertheless, been involved in the processing of data (analyses and transcription).

#### **5.4. A content-centered data construction**

In this section, I provide an outline of general issues regarding data construction in CA studies using video recordings, such as the present thesis. I conclude this section by accounting for how the recorded datasets used in the present thesis can be considered as either content- or participant-centered, and how the general data construction of the thesis can be considered

as content-centered.

CA studies the actual living order of activities organized in human interaction, “which motivates the use of actual recordings of naturally occurring interactions” (Mondada, 2012b, p. 32). CA studies strive for a participant’s perspective on both data construction and analysis. Consequently, the entire chain of data collection (e.g. recordings, selection, transcription) is part of the analysis: the researcher constructs the data when making choices in each stage, therefore the use of the term data construction. The purpose of data construction in all datasets used for this thesis was to capture participants’ naturally occurring interaction in the bilingual educational settings. One issue with “natural” data is that it is never completely natural, in the sense that a researcher and a camera is always present. This is why the data is better called “naturalistic”, rather than natural, “to highlight a sophisticated awareness of the potential for researcher involvement in such material” (Potter, 2012, p. 438). If one wants natural data, it suggests that the camera is supposed to be invisible or at least not noticed. This is somewhat impossible (cf. Gordon, 2012; Lomax & Casey, 1998; Monahan & Fisher, 2010). To expect participants to pretend that the camera is not there would be unnatural. Hence, to gather “as naturally occurring data as possible” it is imperative that the recordings create as little distraction as possible (cf. ten Have, 2006). This is not always a simple task, because an outside observer will always attract some attention when stepping into a classroom. The trick is in minimizing this unwanted attention. For example, this can be done by placing the camera in corners and out of the participants’ way, so that they can go on with their ordinary interaction (ten Have, 2006). By taking on the role of a passive observer and minimizing interaction with the participants, they may accept the presence of the researcher and the camera. To be able to be a passive observer it is important not to let the participants perceive the researcher as a friend or a new staff member (cf. Ivarsson, 2003).

Study 1 (Rusk et al., 2014) discusses the data, transcripts, and analyses of other published CA studies on learning in interaction. No data construction was conducted for the purpose of the study. The aim of Study 1 was to discuss how different approaches to data construction facilitate different analysis and understandings of learning and cognition from emic points of view. The data construction of the present thesis is situated in two approaches to data construction that are discussed in Study 1. The content-centered approach and the participant-centered approach (Study 1, Rusk et al., 2014). The empirical studies in the present thesis use three different datasets in an attempt to study second language learning as social action in children’s everyday at school. Two of the datasets (communicative Finnish as second language program and classroom tandem) used in Studies 2 and 3 in this thesis can be considered content-centered (Rusk et al., 2014). One of the datasets (multilingual seven-year-old children’s everyday at school) used in Study 3 can be considered participant-centered (Rusk et al., 2014). Howev-

er, the main approach to data construction throughout the entire thesis is content-centered. It focuses on learning and development with regard to a specific practice being done or content being talked into being in interaction, which corresponds well with the aim of the thesis. None of the three datasets are pure examples of the approaches; further, this thesis is not a clear-cut example of a content-centered study. The research projects did not identify themselves as participant- or content-centered. All studies include elements of both. Nevertheless, the analytic approach employed for the purpose of this thesis is content-centered.

In the following section, I will account for the data construction of each empirical study in the thesis and conclude by discussing how the thesis, as a whole, can be considered content-centered.

## **Study 2**

Content-centered studies are interested in a specific content or a specific practice in the social interaction. The main feature of the data construction in this approach is that they strive to pinpoint where the practice is done or where the content emerges in the talk-in-interaction, since this is when participants most probably learn the content or practice. In other words, content-centered studies focus on specific settings where a specific content or practice of interest is most likely to be oriented-to or done by participants and, thus, available to be recorded on video. This is challenging as content is considered a contingent phenomenon in CA; it is emergent in the talk-in-interaction (e.g., Schegloff, 2007).

The purpose of the data construction (and analysis) of both content-centered datasets in Study 2 was to capture doing learning (specific practice[s]) on the second language (specific content). Second language educational settings that focus on communicative language instruction were therefore chosen as the settings for the recordings and the study. The recordings focused on interaction in which the practice(s) of doing second language learning would most likely be performed; in the communicative Finnish as second language program this meant recording the interaction of the teacher and children, and in the classroom tandem courses this meant recording the tandem dyads' interaction. In the Finnish as second language program a mobile camera that the researcher could easily handle and move to follow the teacher was used. However, this resulted in occasional loss of audio quality, as an external microphone was not used. In classroom tandem courses the participants were (mostly) stationary at their tables and it was, therefore, possible to use a stationary camera on a tripod and/or GoPro cameras attached to the dyads' tables (Rusk et al., 2014).

The data selection for Study 2 included situations characterized by the second language learner's explicit display of a problem in understanding regarding the second language, including the current activity or assignment, wherein s/he asked for help from a more knowledgeable peer or the teacher.

Within this body of situations, instances in which there seemed to be misunderstandings regarding the current activity or assignment and in which the expressed problems of understanding seemed to be extended, were identified. All 44 of these instances were transcribed in detail and analyzed. Four of these situations are analyzed in detail in Study 2 to highlight issues regarding the use of the second language as the language of instruction in relation to doing second language learning as social action. The analysis is, in other words, quite strictly content-centered with a clear focus on the practices of doing learning on second language content. The analysis pinpoints situations where the practices for performing second language learning would emerge: situations that involved a participant orienting to the role of second language learner when having troubles of understanding the second language and asking for help.

### Study 3

One of the datasets used in Study 3—the MULIE-dataset—can be considered participant-centered although the prevalent data construction of the entire thesis and Study 3 is content-centered. The participant-centered approach focuses on a participant's learning and development. In order to better understand how learning is done anywhere, and anytime, the participant-centered approach strives to capture a holistic view of a focus-participant's everyday life and learning. The starting point of participant-centered studies is the understanding of learning as a social phenomenon emanating from the theories provided by the social-interactional and participationist perspectives on learning (Lave, 1993; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sfard, 2008). The participationist perspective on learning affords a longitudinal analysis of an individual's development in social interaction in order to study learning and provide evidence of learning. Another affordance on the data is that learning can be done anywhere individuals are engaged in social interaction. That is why studies using a participant-centered approach make longitudinal video recordings that capture (most) different settings and situations in which a focus-participant is engaged during a period of time (e.g., a week). The point of departure is the participant and the goal is to achieve a participant's perspective on the social interaction and learning in interaction. Participant-centered studies do not generalize, for example, how (all) participants act. The purpose is to study how specific participants do learning in particular situations and with particular co-participants.

The purpose of the data construction of the participant-centered dataset in this thesis was to capture the seven-year-old children's (Sara's and Simon's) everyday interaction inside and outside of preschool and school in order to record data of their entire everyday interaction from an emic perspective. The points of departure for the dataset's data construction were the focus-participants and what they oriented to and made relevant throughout their day at preschool, school, and post-school activities. The researchers

recorded the children for five preschool/school days. This differs from the content-centered approach, as it defines the participant as the focus and follows the participant in his/her everyday life at school. This implies the use of a mobile camera system (small HD camera on an easy-to-use and mobile tripod) and a wireless microphone on the focus-participant (Rusk et al., 2014).

Study 3 includes data from all four courses of classroom tandem that were recorded from Spring 2013 to Fall 2014, as well as video recordings of one week of Sara's preschool days (Spring 2008) and one week of Simon's school days (Fall 2006). Study 3 can be considered content-centered, although the study used recordings of both, a content-centered and participant-centered approach. As stated earlier, no study is a pure or clear-cut example of a single approach to data construction. Data recorded in a participant-centered approach proved to be usable in an analysis that is more content-centered. That is, the MULIE-data is analyzed through a content-centered approach for Study 3 in an attempt to generalize the results and better discern the generic properties of the practice that is investigated. The data selection included situations characterized by a participant that was oriented-to as more knowledgeable (in relation to the co-participant and the oriented-to second language knowledge), who asked an incongruent interrogative regarding second language knowledge. All 31 instances were then transcribed and analyzed with a focus on the management of epistemic congruence and whether participants appear to orient towards a second language learning object and to second language learning. The analysis focuses on practices that participants seem to be orienting to as learning the specific content of second language knowledge. The focus of the analysis is, thus, content-centered: the aim is to demonstrate how second language learning can be understood as social action that participants do and relate to in interaction. The analysis does not account for analyzing the development of the focus-participants' knowledge regarding the second language, as would a more participant-centered approach.

With reference to these descriptions of the data construction of the separate datasets and empirical studies, the present thesis can be considered a content-centered CA study of second language learning. Parts of the recordings were conducted in participant-centered research projects. However, it is still possible to conduct a content-centered analysis of the recordings for the purposes of the present thesis. The content-centered approach focuses on learning with regards to a specific practice being done or content being talked into being in interaction. The purpose of the data construction of the thesis is to capture practices used to perform second language learning as social action. That is, the point of departure for the thesis are practices used to do learning on the specific content of the second language. Consequently, bilingual educational settings in which both formal and informal second language learning was possible were chosen as the settings for the studies

included in the present thesis.

## 5.5. Transcription

The interaction analyzed in the present study was transcribed using CA conventions (see, e.g., Hepburn & Bolden, 2012; Jefferson, 2004). Not only was talk transcribed, but other multisemiotic resources (e.g., gestures, gaze, movement, and the use of artifacts) were included in the transcripts (cf. Goodwin, 2000; Kääntä, 2010; Melander, 2009; Tanner, 2014). The CA convention of transcribing was first introduced and developed by Jefferson when she was part of Sacks' research group with Schegloff in the 1960s (e.g. Jefferson, 2004; Sacks & Schegloff, 1974). The CA transcription enterprise is a work-in-progress and continues to be developed by the CA community (e.g., Goodwin, 2000; Hepburn & Bolden, 2012; Kääntä, 2010; Melander, 2009; Tanner, 2014; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Musk & Cekaite, forthcoming; Musk, 2014; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014).

The work of transcribing is done by moving back-and-forth between the transcript and video/audio data. The transcript can, in a sense, never be too detailed. However, the analyst has to take into consideration the aspects of the talk-in-interaction and multisemiotic resources that are relevant for the aim of the specific analysis which, in turn, reflect aspects that participants in the data orient towards and make relevant in their locally situated interaction. The CA analysis insists on capturing not only what is said by participants, but also how it is said, since several aspects of the production and delivery of verbal and non-verbal conduct are intrinsic to how participants produce particular actions and respond to others' actions. The talk is transcribed as it is produced (without using phonetic writing) and not as it may have been intended to be produced or how it grammatically should be produced (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012).

Detailed transcripts are a fundamental part of the CA analysis (see Appendix 1 for a glossary of the transcript symbols). The data is always the primary source of the analysis, but the transcripts make the micro details of human social interaction more visible and accessible for a detailed micro-analysis. The transcripts play a huge part in both the study's analysis and in making the data visible and analyzable for readers, so that they can make their own analysis and compare that with the one made for the study. The need for a micro-detailed transcription of selections of data is based on the assumption that no detail in the social interaction can be disregarded, and/or left out of the analysis as accidental or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984a, p. 241). CA, as mentioned before (see Chapter 4), is a discovering science. For an analyst to be able to discover and describe the orderly organization of interaction and practices, the transcripts need to have enough detail (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012).

The workflow of the analysis done for the present thesis can be characterized as very similar to the basic CA methods that are outlined and ex-



plained in Chapter 4. In other words, the work began with observation. That is, watching and listening to the data to discover the practices that may be of interest for the thesis and make narrative notes of (most) practices and activities that participants orient to and make relevant in their social interaction. The next step was to start moving back-and-forth between the notes, data, and the more specific, short situations of interesting interactional phenomena. The situations gradually grew into collections of, for example, incongruent interrogatives, as in Study 3. These collections were transcribed in more detail for the purpose of analyzing the situations on a detailed micro-level. The analysis continued by moving back-and-forth between the detailed transcripts—revising them—and the video data of the same situations. The most prevalent and analytically distinguishable examples were chosen from the collections to be included in the empirical studies for the thesis. In my work with the analysis, I have strived to adhere to the principles of unmotivated looking and to adopt an emic perspective on the data in all stages of the analysis, especially in the initial observational phase. The practices discovered and analyzed for the empirical studies were not predefined. Instead, the data “talked” to me and lead me to the discoveries of the practices that—after rigorous analysis and discussions with other analysts—became the excerpts used in the studies included in the thesis. Approximately 200 hours of video data have been observed—watched and listened to—for the studies included in the present thesis.

Since the transcripts used in the present thesis are of non-English languages (Swedish and Finnish), the English translation is included under each original line. The translation of the transcripts is not idiomatic. They are instead an attempt to replicate the wording, prosody, and way of speaking used by the participants in the situations transcribed to give the English reader a good understanding of what is said. The translation of a transcript from one language to another is analytical work in itself: the translation needs to be represented so that it is sensitive to the subtleties and detailed nuances of the original talk, as well as to how those subtleties are translated (reproduced) into English. The English translation needs to reflect the same details and nuances as the original talk. Therefore, the translation is an integral part of the analysis and not just a mechanical, automated activity (see, e.g., Bucholtz, 2000; Bushnell, 2015; Hepburn & Bolden, 2012; Temple & Young, 2004 for more thorough discussions on translating transcripts).

## **5.6. Ethical considerations**

Ethics are always important to consider when conducting research, but it is particularly important when studying human subjects. It is vital to conduct the research in accordance with principles of respect for the participants and ethical treatment of the human subjects participating in research (Derry et al., 2010). The present study has followed general ethical guidelines required for social video research and the researchers involved in the

data construction have taken ethical considerations into account. The video recordings were always in the focus of rigorous ethic reflection by the researcher (Hägglblom, Melander, & Sahlström, 2003; Derry et al., 2010). All participating parties signed consent forms after ensuring that participants were informed on the purpose of the recordings and that they participated voluntarily. The forms also included information on participants' right to decline participation at any given time and explained that their rights to privacy and confidentiality would be honored throughout the recordings, analysis, and any use of the recorded video data. For minors, the child's parent (or other responsible third party such as a legal guardian) helped the child make the decision to participate or not. Names of everyone involved were anonymized and participants' expectations and rights to privacy and confidentiality were taken into account throughout data construction. The names and places have been changed and anonymized in written excerpts, except when permission to use names of schools, cities, or areas were obtained in the project. Identical rigorous guidelines for pictures and video excerpts were used.

The participants were also made aware that all sound was recorded when external microphones were used. In other words, it is not possible for the participants wearing external microphones to have private conversations when recorded (e.g., Heikkilä & Sahlström, 2003; Hägglblom et al., 2003). In the data used for this study, participants demonstrated that they were aware that recordings were taking place. This is indicated by participants' ability to clearly explain why they were being recorded and for what purpose when someone other than the focal participants asked about the recordings. The participants usually appeared to forget about being recorded fairly quickly and did not seem to mind or be affected by the recordings in any recognizable manner.

The consent forms included paragraphs on how the data is handled and used. The participants were given the opportunity to participate to different degrees. In practice, this meant that participants were able to decide whether (1) the data in which they appear could be used for research and educational purposes, (2) the data could only be used internally for the specific project's analysis, or (3) they did not want to be recorded. The first option implies that the project and researchers related to the project may use short excerpts of the data at, for example, research conferences or university courses. However, data will never be handed to any person outside of the project. All researchers, research assistants, students, and other persons analyzing or viewing the data had to adhere to strict ethical guidelines. The second option gives the researchers and others involved with the project the right to view and analyze data for the project's purposes. However, no data excerpts of participants that have chosen the second option can be shown outside of the project. The third option means that the researchers are not allowed to record these participants and that researchers need to strive to

keep all, even accidental recordings of these persons out of the dataset. Participants who chose the third alternative (so-called “no-participants”) were identified before the recordings began, so that the researcher conducting the recording would be able to identify these participants. The researcher then did his/her utmost to avoid capturing them in any way (video or audio). Sometimes this was impossible. However, the situations in which a no-participant was recorded were not used in the project’s analysis and were permanently erased from the dataset. Alternatively, recording were stopped during those situations where a no-participant was with focal participants.

There is ethical strength in the emic participant’s perspective that CA as a method and approach employs. Because of and thanks to the rigorous emic perspective that ideally permeates the entire process of CA research—from recordings to analysis and results—the participants are seldom described or investigated through categories or definitions that are made relevant by the researcher. The data-internal evidence, the next turn proof procedure, and the emic perspective sifts out categories, actions and activities that participants, themselves, make relevant in their situated social interaction. In other words, the ethical strength lies in the fact that the CA researcher attempts to describe what participants do and how they appear to understand what they do in specific situations, without attaching predetermined categories. There is a respect towards participants’ actions and activities in that the analysis attempts to, as accurately as possible, describe situations from the participant’s perspective. This ethical aspect is seldom addressed; however, it is an advantage for both participants and the researcher when employing CA as a theoretical and methodological framework.

## 6. Summaries of the studies

### 6.1. Study 1

Rusk, F., Pörn, M., Sahlström, F., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2014). Perspectives on using video recordings in conversation analytical studies on learning in interaction. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 38(1), 39–55.

To date, the main method of recording social interaction for later analysis in CA studies is the use of video recordings. The discussion on the method used in these studies has primarily focused either on the analysis and its effects, or on the data construction during fieldwork (see Mondada, 2012b for an overview). These discussions examine the observer's paradox (e.g., Jordan & Henderson, 1995), ethics (e.g., Aarsand & Forsberg, 2010), camera work (e.g., Mondada, 2006), audio vs. video (e.g., ten Have, 2006) and transcription conventions (e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 2004). However, the relation between data construction and analysis is rarely emphasized. Study 1 discusses and elaborates on different approaches to data construction that CA studies in and on learning utilize, and examines how these approaches facilitate different analyses and understandings of learning and cognition from an emic perspective. Three partly overlapping thematic approaches can be discerned: (1) setting-centered, (2) participant-centered, and (3) content-centered. The distinctive differences in the studies can be found in the relationship between data construction and analysis. Different ways of constructing data involve different analysis and, hence, different results both in relation to the understanding of learning and cognition, as well as in relation to the emic points of departure. The underlying interest of the study seems to influence the data construction which, in turn, affects the kind of analysis that can be done. There is considerable variation in the aspects that datasets focus on, where an emphasis in data construction on setting, participant, or content also seems to project the subsequent analytic emphasis. This relation between data construction and analysis is important to be aware of and to address.

The setting-centered approach includes studies that focus on a single setting in everyday life and study the practices and the sequential organization in that specific setting. Most video studies on learning in interaction with a CA perspective focus on a single setting in everyday life and study participants' interaction in that setting for an extensive period of time. The setting is usually the classroom (see, e.g., section 2.3). These classroom studies focus on participants' practices in different situations in the particular setting. Participants and practices might vary, but the classroom as an assumed generic setting frames both data construction and analysis. Setting-centered CA studies on learning provide good insight into the social organization of the classroom from an emic perspective and examine, for example, social

categories and roles that participants orient to as well as how the interaction is sequentially structured and organized. These are questions that setting-centered studies have answered and that they are able to answer thanks to the design of the data construction and how it enables an analysis of the social organization in the setting as a whole. In other words, the setting-centered approach captures what is done there and then in the classroom and how participants talk the specific setting into being. In this case, it is the social organization of settings where learning (supposedly) occurs in the school; the classroom (Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008; Kääntä, 2010; Lee, 2010; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 2004; Young & Miller, 2004).

The participant-centered approach includes studies that recorded and analyzed data from a participant's perspective. One participant, most often one individual, is focused on. What that particular participant orients to is in the center of analysis. The approach is based on social-interactional and participationist perspectives on learning (e.g. Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1993; Sfard, 2008). According to these perspectives, there is a need to be able to longitudinally analyze an individual's development in social interaction to study learning and provide evidence for having done learning. Studies using a participant-centered approach strive to fill this gap in research by recording data from one focal participant's point of view in several different settings. The purpose is to study how specific participants do learning in particular situations with particular co-participants. The participant-centered approach can provide a better understanding of the longitudinality of learning and the development of an individual's understanding of a concept. It is easier for the analyst to relate to the longitudinality of learning if the situations when participants do learning on specific topics are in the data and, hence, available for analysis (Melander, 2012b; Sahlström, 2011; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012; Wootton, 1997).

The content-centered approach is characterized by a focus on either a specific content or a specific practice in the social interaction in a specific setting. Content-centered studies are interested in the talk-in-interaction regarding a specific content or in how a specific interactional practice is done. The data construction of studies in this approach strive to pinpoint where the practice is done or where the content emerges in the talk-in-interaction, since that is when participants most probably do learning on the content or practice. That is why the central point of content-centered studies is specific settings or situations where a specific content or practice of interest is most likely to be done by participants and, hence, can be recorded on video (Ekström, 2012; Lindwall & Lymer, 2011; Lindwall & Ekström, 2012; Lymer, 2010).

Study 1 presents and discusses these three approaches to data construction that can be identified in the growing field of studies on learning in interaction from a CA perspective. All of the studies draw on the social-interactional and/or participationist perspective on learning (Lave & Wenger,

1991; Lave, 1993; Sfard, 1998; Sfard, 2008) and use CA's emic perspective for data construction and analysis. The data is naturalistic and of naturally occurring settings. The analysis focuses on what is observable in the data and what the participants in the data orient towards. The studies also, to a large extent, share a common view on cognition as socially shared and situated in social practices and activities. Distinctive differences emerge when comparing the relation between the data construction and analysis. The setting-centered approach can provide evidence of participants' learning, socially shared cognition, and affordances for learning in situations in a specific setting (e.g., the classroom). The participant-centered approach can capture various settings and most situations in which the participant discusses and develops his/her understanding of an oriented-to learning object. The content-centered approach can capture interactional practices linked to learning a specific content/practice and how participants in those situations change their knowing in the unfolding talk-in-interaction regarding the content/practice.

A chain in methodology and method can be discerned: the design of the data construction seems to influence the choice of focus for the analysis which, in turn, affects which aspects of learning that are studied. There is considerable variation in what aspects datasets focus on. Further, the emphasis on setting, participant, or content also seems to project the subsequent analytic emphasis. It is important to be aware of and address the relation between data construction and analysis. However, contemporary studies seldom recognize how the underlying primary interest; (1) an interest in the social organization of a setting and how it links to learning, (2) an interest in studying a participant's learning in interaction, or (3) a focus on the learning/teaching of a content/practice influences the data construction which, in turn, affects the kind of analysis that can be done. The explication of this chain of data construction and analysis may help future studies in the planning of their data construction as per their interests and perspectives on learning in interaction.

## 6.2. Study 2

Rusk, E., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016). The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 184–205.

Studies on the use of the first language in second language educational settings are often prescriptive and have prescriptive arguments. In contrast, Study 2 attempts to describe and understand the actual language use of participants in the contexts investigated to encourage a pedagogical discussion on the use of both the first language and the second language when doing second language learning (see also, e.g., Amir & Musk, 2013; Üstünel &

Seedhouse, 2005).

Using the first language to solve problems of understanding the second language may be beneficial for second language learning. However, the overuse of the first language may deprive second language learners from exposure to the second language. The question is not whether to use the first language or the second language; it is when and how each language can be used to support second language learning. Study 2 focuses on situations in which an L2 learner has problems understanding the current activity or assignment (which involves understanding the second language) and asks for help from a more knowledgeable participant (a teacher or peer), and more specifically, on situations in which the first language is not used in an attempt to solve the second language learner's problems of understanding the current assignment. The aim is to investigate what role participants' management of theirs and others' knowledge (regarding the second language and the current assignment) play in maintaining intersubjectivity and doing second language learning in these situations. The data includes video recordings from two different second language educational settings in which the second language is used as the language of instruction: communicative Finnish as second language program for seven-year-old Swedish-speaking children (see section 5.1) and a classroom tandem course (see section 5.2).

The belief—mainly among second language teachers and educational practitioners—that the most effective way of learning a second language involves the exclusive use of the second language in the classroom is still strong (cf. Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2010). One reason for this may be the fact that immersion programs are often cited as successful language programs (e.g., Krashen, 1984; McMillan & Turnbull, 2010). A prominent feature of immersion programs is the teacher's exclusive use of the second language. Consequently, the view on first language use in second language educational settings is that it reduces the second language learner's input and exposure to the second language, hence, interfering with the learning of a second language (e.g., Krashen, 1982).

Study 2 focuses on troubles with intersubjectivity related to second language knowledge—including differing expectations regarding this knowledge—in situations where participants do not code-switch but rely on the second language to repair breakdowns of intersubjectivity (see, e.g., Hellermann, 2009; Lilja, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Majlesi & Broth, 2012). These situations differ from situations in which participants rely on code-switching, since participants—in the situations analyzed in Study 2—have to rely on limited second language knowledge. This knowledge aspect introduces additional risks of further difficulties when doing the repair, since second language learners bring a special set of “characteristics, capacities, vulnerabilities, and practices of speaking, hearing, and understanding” (Schegloff, 2000, p. 234) into the social interaction. Breakdowns of intersubjectivity, troubles in sense-making practices, and a lack of mutual understanding in the so-

cial interaction may hinder second language learning (e.g., Markee, 2000; Hall et al., 2011; Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Seedhouse, 2004). Several studies indicate that first language use may be beneficial in situations where participants are faced with many difficult activities and wherein the second language learner's knowledge of the second language is limited (e.g., Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Behan, Turnbull, & Spek, 1997; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Kern, 1994; Macaro, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Thoms, Liao, & Szustak, 2005). Upholding the principle of using the second language as the language of instruction seems to add epistemic domains regarding language knowledge and expectations of language knowledge that the participants need to be aware of. The dynamic use of the first language to repair breakdowns of intersubjectivity in linguistically difficult activities in the second language and to do learning on conceptual second language knowledge can be beneficial, as it provides an additional interactional tool for meaning-making. However, the overuse of the first language may limit the exposure and, hence, deprive learners of linguistic input.

The results indicate that there are opportunities for second language learners to do learning in-and-through the second language on familiar content that they already have knowledge of in their first language. Arguments for dynamic language use to do second language learning become visible when the problem is not only lexical and/or contextual. Although participants orient to the immediate contextual situation and employ semiotic resources in support of maintaining intersubjectivity in-and-through the use of the second language, there still seem to be aspects in both the second language and the practical context that can be misunderstood. In some cases, because of diverse knowledge and diverse expectations of their own and others' knowledge of the second language, participants do not seem to achieve mutual understanding regarding what it is that the co-participant does and does not know regarding the second language there and then. It seems that the use of the second language in an attempt to clarify these epistemic discrepancies further expands and extends the breakdowns of intersubjectivity. A dynamic approach to the use of both languages as tools for meaning-making could help in these situations when the second language learner's second language knowledge appears to be limited.

The principle of using the second language also seems to restrict the possibilities for doing second language learning on conceptual knowledge that is not directly tied to situational activities and completion of assignments. Instead of doing learning on the conceptual knowledge of the words in the second language, the participants focus on moving on to the next activity. The participants appear to consider the practical completion of the assignment to be an adequate, locally relevant epistemic balance. This may be because the more knowledgeable participants claim epistemic authority regarding what is needed to know of the second language to be able to do the current assignment, and the use of the second language to do learn-



ing on the learning objects may be too difficult. The more knowledgeable participants seem to orient to the second language learner's epistemic status regarding the oriented-to learning object as too weak, that is, the more knowledgeable participant orients to—expects—the second language learner to not have enough background knowledge of the second language to do learning on the concepts. The epistemic balance is situationally adequate for the participants to complete the assignment and move on.

The assignment or activity seems to frame and influence what knowledge is locally relevant and minimally required. Less knowledgeable participants, supported by more knowledgeable participants, can complete assignments and be part of activities in second language educational settings without having knowledge of concepts, as long as the current assignment/activity is completed. It seems that the intricate epistemic context and circumstances regarding who knows what in the second language and of the content require participants to be extra vigilant regarding the management of epistemic statuses and stances they express in the talk-in-interaction. The results show that a shared understanding of what participants know or do not know may require interactional work that involves first language use, and that more knowledgeable participants can orient to epistemic authority and indicate when an adequate epistemic balance is reached for the practical purposes of the current assignment/activity, even though conceptual knowledge of the oriented-to problem in the second language does not seem to be achieved. The dynamic use of the first language in these situations, as a resource for meaning-making among many others, may be beneficial for second language learners and more knowledgeable participants alike.

Second language learning is not limited to lexical knowledge and Study 2 does not suggest that no second language learning is done in the excerpts analyzed, quite the opposite. On one hand, the use of the first language can be beneficial, as it helps meaning-making in situations when the second language learner's second language knowledge is limited, and on the other hand, the overuse of the first language could limit the exposure and deny second language learners of the linguistic input to improve their second language proficiency. The primary goal of any second language educational setting is to support learners in doing second language learning. Practices that compromise this learning should be avoided (cf. Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2010). However, it seems paradoxical that this goal is approached—in a bilingual setting, such as the ones analyzed for Study 2—by employing the principle of using the second language as the language of instruction. This principle encourages monolingualism in a bilingual classroom at the expense of doing second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity. When participants choose not to use the first language to do second language learning on more abstract concepts or when breakdowns of intersubjectivity emerge, they seem to discard a viable interactional resource for meaning-making, maintaining intersubjectivity, and doing second language

learning.

Study 2's findings suggest that when participants deploy practices to co-construct recognizable objects of learning the second language in the second language, they also attend to practices through which they achieve and maintain a shared understanding of their joint activities. Study 2 contributes to a better understanding of how participants' management of their dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge is part of both practices for doing learning and meaning-making. In other words, practices for doing second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity are better understood as co-operating. Participants establish and maintain a shared understanding of their joint activities, including learning, in-and-through the management of both, their own and others' knowledge in the talk-in-interaction

### 6.3. Study 3

Rusk, F., Sahlström, F., & Pörn, M. (accepted). Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: Incongruent interrogative-practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction. *Linguistics and Education*.

The aim of Study 3 is to investigate how the incongruent interrogative is part of the practices peers use to perform second language learning as social action. More specifically, the analytical focus is on the management of epistemic congruence in peer interaction when a participant asks an incongruent interrogative regarding second language knowledge. The situations analyzed are characterized by a participant (oriented-to as more knowledgeable) asking a co-participant (oriented-to as less knowledgeable) an incongruent interrogative regarding an oriented-to learning object relating to second language knowledge. The data consist of video recordings from classroom tandem courses (see section 5.2) and video recordings of seven-year-old children's entire days at preschool and primary school (see section 5.3). The reason for using such varied and rich data for the study is to be able to better discern the more generic interactional properties of the practice under scrutiny. Classroom tandem's most central function as an institution is to provide opportunities for peers to scaffold and support each other's language learning. That is why the data used in Study 3 has been expanded to also include data of other bilingual settings in which peers may perform second language learning through the use of incongruent interrogatives.

Several strands of research, including CA studies on second language classrooms, show that teachers often ask questions to which they already know the answer: incongruent interrogatives. These questions have been extensively studied and analyzed as, for example, known-answer questions, exam questions, display questions, or as part of the IRE sequence (e.g.,

Hargreaves, 2012; Lee, 2010; Long & Sato, 1983; Macbeth, 2003; Margutti, 2006; Margutti, 2010; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Radford, Blatchford, & Webster, 2011; Searle, 1969; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Waring, 2012; among several others). Many CA studies concerned with incongruent interrogatives in classrooms focus on repair practices. There is, therefore, an extensive body of research on repair in second language classrooms (see section 6.6. and, e.g., Hauser, 2009; Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Kääntä, 2010; Macbeth, 2004; Markee, 2000; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Markee, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Mori, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). Previous research indicates that the teacher asks incongruent interrogatives in order to, for example, evaluate students' understanding and/or learning, or to make the students rehearse/display knowledge that they have previously learned. For example, the teacher can, in-and-through an incongruent interrogative, initiate (other-initiation) repair in the next turn after the trouble source and the student does self-correction. Students are, in other words, not given the correct answer, but are encouraged to identify it themselves (McHoul, 1990). It appears that repair practices and incongruent interrogatives are part of the business (e.g., teaching, instructing, and learning) of the talk-in-interaction in pedagogical institutions and learning contexts like the second language classroom (e.g., Kitzinger, 2012; Macbeth, 2004; Schegloff et al., 2002). The teacher's incongruent interrogatives appear to be part of the building blocks of the institutional activities in the classroom (cf. Hayano, 2012; Schegloff et al., 2002). However, these questions are also criticized as being dispreferred (Slotte-Lüttge, 2005) or as not being "communicative" (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Gibbons, 1998; Markee, 1995). Participants even appear to socially construct situations that may prevent actions that could promote second language understanding and learning when employing incongruent interrogatives (Markee, 2004). Nevertheless, incongruent interrogatives appear to be a common part of participants' talk-in-interaction in second language classrooms and are prevalent in both teacher- and learner-centered classrooms (cf. Gardner, 2012).

Known-answer questions are often investigated when asked by teachers. Few studies have recognized a need for research on how peers use known-answer questions, and for what interactional purposes. CA studies on second language learning and peer learning show that peers actively do learning in concert with each other, especially in task-oriented learner-centered classrooms and at school outside of the classroom (e.g., Gardner, 2012; Mori, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004; Sahlström et al., 2013). Peers are, in other words, involved in doing second language learning. They orient to and co-construct roles as second language teacher and second language learner, and employ several different interactional resources for instructing and doing second language learning in social interaction (see, e.g., Jakonen, 2014a; Jakonen, 2014b; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Lilja, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Sahlström, 2011; Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012). However, studies on

how peers use incongruent interrogatives—a central pragmatic resource for teachers in second language classrooms—as part of second language learning have not been conducted. Hence, Study 3 investigates how the incongruent interrogative is part of practices that participants use to perform second language learning as social action in peer-to-peer situations. These practices may seem closely related to what previous research have analyzed as repair practices (see section 3.3). However, Study 3 provides a more nuanced view of the interactional use of the incongruent interrogative as part of peer second language learning-oriented practices in order to convey both the complexity, as well as the sensitiveness of participants' practices from an emic perspective. This is done by employing the epistemics framework in the analysis of these practices.

The study draws on an analysis of two different and varied datasets in an attempt to be able to draw more generalized conclusions and tease out the more generic properties of the analyzed practice. Six excerpts are presented and analyzed in greater detail. The findings are based on the larger body of analyzed material, but are exemplified through six excerpts in which a more knowledgeable participant asks an incongruent interrogative regarding an oriented-to learning object in the second language. The analytical focus is on the actions that participants recognize the incongruent interrogative-practices to accomplish in situations when participants explicitly orient to second language learning objects. The excerpts are divided into three sections. The first section includes situations in which a more knowledgeable participant asks an incongruent interrogative in the next turn after an expressed unknowing by the less knowledgeable participant. The second section includes situations in which the more knowledgeable participant asks an incongruent interrogative in the first turn of a sequence and through it initiates an instructional sequence. In both situations described in these sections, the less knowledgeable participants—the recipients—respond by aligning with the invitations that the incongruent interrogatives initiate. In other words, the less knowledgeable participants display an orientation towards the help that the more knowledgeable participant provides and they seem to actively try to find out the answer by producing possible answers or expressing weak unknowing stances. The third section represents situations in which the less knowledgeable participant resists, disaligns from, engaging in the instructional sequence that the incongruent interrogative initiates and where the more knowledgeable participant subsequently orients to this contingency.

The results indicate that the incongruent interrogatives analyzed in this article have several similar characteristics of second language classroom talk, especially teacher's known-answer questions and the IRE sequence (e.g., Kasper, 2004; Mehan, 1979; Mori, 2004; Tanner, 2014). In second language classrooms, the teacher asks incongruent interrogatives to scaffold and support the student's own learning and development (cf. Drew, 2012;

Margutti, 2010; Markee, 2004). The focus of these studies is often on the teacher and the teacher's practices. In other words, they focus on the instructional practices. In Study 3, the focus is on the co-operation between the speaker of the incongruent interrogative (the more knowledgeable participant) and the recipient (the less knowledgeable participant). That is, the emphasis of the analysis is on learning as a joint activity and not only on the instructional practices of, for example, a teacher. That is why the focus in Study 3 is on peer-to-peer interaction.

Study 3 found that the incongruent interrogative is a practice that peers use in relation to doing second language learning and it performs two main actions from both the speaker's and recipient's standpoint: (1) it initiates an instructional sequence and (2) in-and-through that action, it proposes reciprocal epistemically asymmetric statuses as the participants co-construct their locally relevant roles as second language teacher and second language learner. The participant at the receiving end of an incongruent interrogative can either (1) align with the projected sequence trajectory by providing possible answers or expressing weak unknowing stances or (2) resist engaging actively in the proposed instructional sequence, that is, disalign by expressing a strong unknowing stance.

Incongruent interrogatives are used like this when the oriented-to knowledge is primarily in the speaker's epistemic domain. That is, when participants' epistemic statuses (regarding the oriented-to learning object) are more or less identified. In most of the cases analyzed, the less knowledgeable participant produces an answer that is oriented to as correct by both participants without much help from the more knowledgeable participant. However, in some cases the less knowledgeable participant is unknowing regarding the requested knowledge (Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk et al., 2016). The participants, then, do not seem to repeat once-addressed incongruent interrogatives and push the oriented-to less knowledgeable participant. That is, more knowledgeable participants use incongruent interrogatives when they understand that there is a possibility that the less knowledgeable participant might know the answer, which makes launching an instructional sequence subsequently possible. In other words, the speaker (K+) invites the recipient (K-) to do L2 learning and, if aligned, the participants orient to change the less knowledgeable participant's status from K- to K+ through a form of self-repair, in mutual cooperation. This appears to be a way of giving the less knowledgeable participant a chance to do successful learning, instead of focusing on problems, troubles, and failures (cf. Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 801). They correct themselves, instead of being corrected, and their answers are acknowledged and confirmed by a peer. The epistemic sensitivity and the situated interactional roles that are talked into being provide a foundation for participants to use incongruent interrogatives as a practice to perform second language learning as social action in concert with each other.

Participants' invocation of the reciprocal roles of second language teach-

er and second language learner and use of incongruent interrogatives as part of doing second language learning is linked to the finding that the learning object is oriented to as primarily in the speaker's, the more knowledgeable participant's, epistemic domain. That is, the participants occupy epistemically asymmetric positions on the epistemic gradient in relation to each other and the oriented-to and co-constructed learning object relating to second language knowledge. These roles are, in other words, interactionally talked into being and oriented-to by both participants. The role of epistemic status in the production and recognition of learning as social action in-and-through the use of incongruent interrogatives appears to be of importance, in conjunction with the linguistic design of the turns when understood by participants in the social interaction (Heritage, 2013). By considering second language learning as action that participants do and orient to, it appears that the incongruent interrogative is specifically designed and used by participants to initiate specific forms of practices and perform second language learning as social action.

The goal of the analysis in Study 3 was to discover practices that participants employ to produce and understand second language learning as social action and make them explicit. The findings indicate that incongruent interrogatives are recurrent, specifically situated in a sequence, and attract distinctive responses, which distinguish them from related or similar conduct, such as repair practices. The incongruent interrogatives, as they are used in the situations analyzed for Study 3, appear to be recognizable to the recipients by what social action the speaker intends to accomplish, which is indicated by the recipients' responses that indicate an orientation towards a learning object in the second language and towards changing the recipients' knowledge of the second language learning object there and then. Hence, doing learning appears to involve a sequence that involves an organization of action. The sequence can be tracked for what interactional outcomes—social actions—participants are pursuing. To put it simply, the actions that doing learning comprises include (among possible others) initiation of instructional sequence, including a proposal of epistemically asymmetric statuses, and alignment or disalignment that lead to either an answer (to the interrogative) or an abandonment of the project.

## 7. Discussion

In this thesis, a CA approach with a social-interactional perspective on learning is applied to the study of second language learning as social action in bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) educational settings. The analytical focus is on the structures of social interaction and the underlying mechanisms of human sociality, and more specifically on learning as social action. In-and-through that focus, the present thesis attempts to describe practices that are used by participants to perform second language learning.

Overall, the discussion focuses on the analytical tools of CA and how CA's understanding of social interaction as contextual, systematic, and structured; the notions of epistemic status and stance; and the management of epistemic (in)congruence provides for a better understanding of how participants manage each other's knowing and orient to different learning objects to perform second language learning as social action. The discussion is divided into three sections. The first (7.1) is a methodological discussion with a focus on how the different steps in the chain of the data construction is part of the analysis when using video recordings to study second language learning in interaction from an emic participant's perspective. The focus is on how the content-centered approach may help to better understand learning as social action. The second (7.2) is a discussion on the particularities of the contexts investigated for this thesis regarding the results of the studies in relation to the Finnish-Swedish bilingual settings. The section also discusses the findings regarding participants' practices for meaning-making and maintaining a shared understanding when orienting towards doing second language learning in the contexts under scrutiny. The third (7.3) presents a more generalized perspective on how participants actively orient to their mutual activities as doing second language learning and, more specifically, discusses the results of the studies that indicate that the incongruent interrogative can be considered a practice that is part of the organization of practices in-and-through which participants do second language learning.

### 7.1. Data construction is part of the analysis of learning in interaction

Video data is used in many studies on learning in interaction, including CA studies on learning. The discussion on method in these CA studies has primarily focused on either the analysis or the recordings. The relation between these two rarely receives attention, even though it affects the aspects of learning that are studied. Data construction in video studies is an analytic choice per se and it shapes the subsequent analytic possibilities and, thus, the results (e.g., Rusk et al., 2014). In the following section, I will elaborate on this and discuss their methodological implications with regards to the studies conducted for this thesis.

CA studies strive for an emic perspective for both data construction and analysis. The main part of the analysis includes social categories, activities, and actions that participants make relevant and co-construct in their situated interaction. To be able to analyze video recordings from an emic perspective, the recordings also need to be of an emic nature and capture natural activities (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). They cannot be, for example, edited recordings of experimental, unnatural settings. Data construction is, therefore, restricted by an idea of recordings of naturally occurring activities, which is derived from CA's "naturalistic stance" (Mondada, 2012a, p. 32). CA, as a methodological framework, attempts to study the actual organized order of activities in human interaction through the entire chain of data construction (recordings, selection, transcription, and analysis). In other words, the entire chain is part of the analysis, and the researcher has to make analytical choices at each step.

According to CA, no detail in the social interaction can be disregarded as accidental or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984a, p. 241). However, regarding data construction (and transcription), no method can capture all details of the social interaction in naturally occurring situations. At every stage of the data construction, analytic choices are made, and these choices all narrow down the analytic possibilities as well as the possible results. Therefore, the choices made at different stages of data construction are as important to bear in mind and explicate as the choices regarding aspects of the interaction that should be included in the transcription of the interaction. In other words, the researcher's role in the entire chain of data construction may appear inconsistent with the idea of naturally occurring social interaction since the researcher has to make these choices. However, the analysis of the data through CA is rigorous. Although the data is only a small part of the entire, real situation, the CA analysis compensates this loss with a strong focus on data-internal evidence: the emic participant's perspective and the inclusion of rich micro-details of human social interaction.

The fact that these choices matter becomes apparent, as all studies included in the analysis of Study 1 (Rusk et al., 2014) have common theoretical and methodological grounds: (1) they draw on a social-interactional, and/or participationist perspective on learning and employ a CA perspective on the data construction and analysis, (2) data comprise naturally occurring activities, (3) the analysis focuses on aspects that the participants make relevant, and (4) the studies also, to a large extent, share a common view on cognition as socially shared and situated in social practices and activities. However, the underlying interests of the studies influence data construction which, in turn, affects possible analyses. There is considerable variation in aspects that datasets focus on: an emphasis on setting, participant, or content. The three different approaches to data construction can be linked to three different ways of examining learning and cognition using CA. (1) The setting-centered approach focuses on understanding learning in instruc-



tional settings by investigating how, for example, classroom interaction is organized. (2) The participant-centered approach focuses on the longitudinality of learning and development by tracking overtly displayed social cognition of a focus-participant's talk-in-interaction. (3) The content-centered approach focuses on the learning/teaching of a content/practice and how participants adapt and change their participation in the unfolding interaction with regards to the content or practice. In other words, learning—the object of these studies—is conceived differently within each approach.

The terms reliability and validity are seldom used in qualitative studies and even less in CA studies. Nevertheless, the terms are of significance to explicate the scientific rigour of research. CA's analytical method and methodology regarding the microanalysis of human social interaction is robust and provides readers to use their discernment and conduct their own analysis of the excerpts, thereby improving the reliability of the studies. The importance of the next turn proof procedure and the data-internal evidence for CA studies helps make the analyses more valid. However, it is paramount to acknowledge the data construction and how it affects the study's reliability. The researcher necessarily makes choices in each stage of the data collection, which is why the term data construction is used. The point is not to abandon video recording as a method for data construction, rather, it is important to explicate and be aware of how choices in the field influence the analysis and results of the study. To ignore this is to only partly understand how the study yielded the results that it did. The data includes only bits and pieces of a more complex reality. This is why it is important for video researchers to acknowledge the fact that the data construction is part of the analysis and that the explication of choices made increases the study's reliability.

Of the three approaches to data construction discussed in Study 1 (Rusk et al., 2014), the present thesis is (almost exclusively) content-centered in its data construction and analysis. The present thesis analyzes learning as situated social action without strong claims of longitudinality or development over time, as the participant-centered approach advocates. The present thesis also aims at studying learning as emic practices that are conceptualized within CA, without the use of other sociocultural theories on learning to discuss possibilities or affordances for learning in the interaction that the setting-centered approach advocates. The present thesis is interested in specific practices that participants use to perform learning on the second language (a specific content) in concert with each other. This fits well within the content-centered approach to data construction and analysis. The approach helps provide the tools to better understand learning as situated social action without the use of other learning theories or claims of longitudinality. It also helps to better understand the organization of the situated practices that participants use to perform social actions that can be considered second language learning.

The empirical data used in the studies of this thesis are from research projects that are not explicitly content- or participant-centered. However, the data construction of each project fits well with the aim of this thesis and the content-centered approach. Although one part of the data construction is from a project that leans more towards a participant-centered approach of recording, this did not appear to obstruct the use of the data or obscure the data in a content-centered analysis. No study is a pure and clear-cut example of one approach and it is possible to conduct data constructions that appear to be mixed. The reliability and validity of each study stems from how the researcher explicates awareness of the relation between data construction and analysis.

Overall, the data used in the thesis is rich, varied, and diverse. This helps better understanding how different participants in different settings and contexts appear to use similar practices to perform second language learning. I have decided to include various and different settings as data for the studies in the thesis to be able to make any generic claims on the practices (Sidnell, 2012a). By collecting instances of similar practices from various settings and contexts the thesis can provide a better understanding of, and tease out, the generic properties of practices that participants use to perform second language learning (see section 4). The making of collections of practices from various settings is by no means a straight forward method of simply picking the most prototypical instances. There are challenges in such an approach. Building a collection “is a matter of extreme delicacy” (Sidnell, 2012a, p. 98). For example, the relationship between practice and action is contingent and requires an alertness to the entire range of possible resources that participants use when (co-)constructing action in talk-in-interaction (Sidnell, 2012a). Not to mention that each instance is unique with its distinctive context and interactional properties, which the analyst needs to be attentive to. The collection should also include deviant cases of the practice. This makes the building of a collection even more of a challenge (see section 4). Another consideration of importance when making a collection is to identify a practice that happens often enough to be able to build a sufficiently large collection. The above mentioned strengths and challenges of building collections is why the present thesis employs data from various settings in an attempt to make more generic claims on the practices analyzed and to build a large enough collection.

The data is recorded in bilingual educational settings, which in themselves influence the practices that the current thesis investigates (e.g., Drew & Heritage, 1992). The settings are part of bilingual educational institutions with a focus on bilingualism and/or second language learning. In CA, the institutional interaction is understood as being more constrained, systematized, and restricted regarding the interactional practices that participants can employ (see section 2.3, Heritage, 2005). For example, Drew and Heritage (1992, pp. 21–22) identify three characteristics of institutional interac-

tion that differ from ordinary conversation: (1) at the center of the participants' talk is the core goal of the institution, (2) participants have unequal opportunities to contribute to the interaction and the institutional goals, and (3) participants' reasonings are guided by the context and task of the institution.

In the case of the second language educational settings investigated in the present study, the core institutional goal is that teachers are supposed to teach learners the second language (Seedhouse, 2004). Students in classrooms have unequal opportunities to contribute to the interaction compared to the teacher, especially when considering whole-class conversations. The school and classroom also guides the students' and teachers' reasonings towards learning, curricula, grades, and other aspects related to the task of the institution. In other words, students and teachers in the investigated settings are oriented to aspects of the second language and the learning/teaching of the second language. Put simply, it is the teacher who teaches and supports the children in the communicative second language program and it is the first language speakers who support the second language speakers in the tandem classroom. There is also, in both of these settings, a focus on task-completion, as shown in the analysis of participants using a minimal epistemic balance as a way to move on (see section 6.2, Study 2). However, these institutionalized roles are not present in the same way in the data of the seven-year-old children who do learning outside of the classroom and with their peers. This is a reason for employing such varied data from different settings. Another important aspect regarding the settings' possible influence on the talk-in-interaction is that this influence—according to a conversation analytic understanding of institutions—has to be made relevant by the participants in their situated social practices and actions. Participants bring the institutional context into being through the sequential unfolding of the interaction (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; Heritage, 2005). That is, the settings would not be bilingual second language educational settings if the participants would not talk the institutions into being by invoking their respective roles (the roles of teacher and student in the case of the school and a classroom, and first/second language speaker/learner).

The present thesis focuses on practices that participants, themselves, orient to as doing second language learning and how those practices are structured and organized in social interaction. Hence, in accordance with a content-centered approach to data construction, the focus was on specific settings or situations where a specific content (second language) or practice of interest is most likely to be done by participants and available for video recording. In other words, I acknowledge that the data chosen for analysis may be data in which the practices of interest are more likely to appear, and that the business of the talk-in-interaction in the institutions that are studied is to teach and learn the second language. However, by employing rich and varied data, the thesis still succeeds at making (some) generic claims

regarding practices that participants themselves orient to as doing second language learning.

## **7.2. Management of knowledge of languages in bilingual second language educational settings**

The data of Study 2 and part of Study 3 stem from bilingual second language educational settings, using the second language as language of instruction. The possibilities of doing second language learning in these contexts seem good when the content is familiar to the participants and when activities are situated. The complex epistemic circumstances regarding who knows what of the second language and the content emerge, for example, when an epistemic discrepancy between participants regarding the oriented-to learning object and current task unfolds in the interaction (Rusk et al., 2016). Diverse knowledge of the second language, diverse possible understandings regarding the assignments, and diverse expectations regarding second language knowledge come to play as the interaction unfolds. Participants may not necessarily have a shared understanding of who knows what (epistemic discrepancy), but they may still have an understanding of the kind of activity they are involved in (e.g., what kind of assignment they are completing). However, the epistemic discrepancies can be traced back to when the participants start and agree on doing the assignment in concert with each other, thus, mutually agreeing on understanding it and what to do. In other words, the participants' likelihood of completing the assignments correctly may be hindered by the epistemic discrepancy regarding both the second language and the assignment. The use of the second language when explaining and repeating the assignment does not seem to help in solving the situations and a considerable amount of time is used for reaching a mutual understanding and knowledge of the assignment.

Participants engaged in social interaction (often) have epistemic access to the same interactional phenomena in the second language that they make relevant. However, that access may differ fundamentally based on their background knowledge regarding the first/second language compared to the language of the assignment and the oriented-to learning object. These situations are related to what Heritage calls "complex and difficult epistemic circumstances" in which "incommensurate epistemic resources are in conflict" (Heritage, 2012c, p. 5; Sidnell, 2012b, p. 55). Who knows what, and how, and to which degree, and in which language? The use of the second language in resolving the breakdowns of intersubjectivity may lead to extended and expanded misunderstandings rather than contribute to solving the problem. A precondition for engaging in social activity is knowing what that activity is about and knowing what to do in that activity. That is why achieving and maintaining intersubjectivity is of importance for participants to be able to accomplish joint projects and activities, such as doing second

language learning (Mondada, 2011a; Mondada, 2011b). Problems with the intersubjectivity and sense-making practices in the social interaction may hinder the joint, situated, social action of second language learning (e.g., Hall et al., 2011; Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). The complex and difficult epistemic circumstances regarding knowledge and expectations of knowledge, of the first/second language, and of who knows what in their first/second language seem to allow for misunderstandings regarding how participants orient to and understand each other's knowing. These misunderstandings may, in turn, lead to breakdowns in intersubjectivity and in the failure to do second language learning. In the settings under scrutiny, participants appear to need to clearly express their un/knowing and be sensitive to both their own and others' expressions of un/knowing to reach a mutual understanding of what the learning object is and how they do learning on that learning object. That is, participants need to be attentive to both practices for doing second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity in the talk-in-interaction. Both the organization of sense-making-practices and learning-practices appear to be better understood as co-operating, than as mutually exclusive. With this in mind, the dynamic use of the second language learner's first language should not be excluded from the range of available tools for meaning-making.

The bilingual setting may also be an epistemic setting in which the sources and bases of epistemic authority (Stivers et al., 2011; Sidnell, 2012b, p. 55) regarding the oriented-to learning objects and the languages used may vary widely. Who has the right to know something and to what degree? Another question would be when and how does a participant have the right to know what the co-participant knows or does not know? This epistemic complexity becomes apparent when less knowledgeable participants ask more knowledgeable participants questions regarding the second language—orienting towards doing learning and expressing a learning object—and the more knowledgeable participant leaves the question unanswered (Rusk et al., 2016). This is most often the case when the learning object is regarding conceptual knowledge, an abstract concept, or a more in-depth concept that is not directly tied to the contextual and situated activities. The principle of using the second language in second language educational settings seems to restrict the possibilities for doing second language learning on these concepts. One reason may be that the participants choose not to use the other common language to do learning on these words and concepts that are not contextual and directly related to the immediate activities. In other words, they adhere to the principle of using the second language as the language of instruction, instead of using the other common language as a tool to do learning on the conceptual knowledge of the words in the second language. The participants focus on moving to the next activity, instead of reaching a “real” epistemic balance regarding the oriented-to conceptual second language knowledge. This seems to partly relate to the more knowledgeable

participant's epistemic authority in the sense that they are allowed to choose what knowledge is relevant for the current activity and/or assignment. That is, a shared understanding of what each participant knows requires interactional work; more knowledgeable participants can set its terms by indicating when the less knowledgeable participant appears to know enough for the practical purposes of the current activity.

Another reason may be that the more knowledgeable participant orients to the conceptual second language knowledge as too difficult, and that the second language learner's second language knowledge is too limited for the use of the second language to do learning on the concept. Either way, the participants agree on only relying on the minimally required situational understanding and knowledge for completing the assignments/activities, instead of expanding on or launching an instructional sequence on the oriented-to conceptual content. This epistemic authority and orientation to language knowledge also involves expectations of one's own and other's language knowledge. In other words, the more knowledgeable participant seems to orient to the second language learner as not having enough background knowledge of the second language to do learning on the concepts. The participants agree that an adequate, locally relevant, epistemic balance is necessary to be able to do the assignment—practically—without having conceptual knowledge of the words that are used to complete the assignment.

It seems that the intricate context and circumstances regarding both knowledge of who knows what regarding the second language and the content, as well as expectations of knowledge require participants to be vigilant regarding the management of epistemic statuses and the stances they express in the talk-in-interaction. Study 2 shows how epistemic status may be complicated when discussing the knowing of language(s) in bilingual second language educational settings, since language is both the vehicle of what a participant knows and the content in these specific contexts of second language education. For example, a second language learner can know a lot about a specific epistemic domain, but not know the second language well enough to express this knowing. This is an issue for both the analyst and the participants doing second language learning in the settings. When doing second language learning, both the more knowledgeable participant and the less knowledgeable participant have to keep track of what the co-participant(s) know, and do not know, regarding the oriented-to learning object. This is complex enough without having to do it in the second language. However, participants seem to be able to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity in these epistemic landscapes, albeit sometimes they face difficulties using the second language. This may be because second language learning is not limited to accumulating vocabulary knowledge. It also includes, for example, ways of managing oneself in situations where the language is not entirely familiar. It is not only the more knowledgeable participant who is

responsible for the second language learning and maintaining intersubjectivity; the second language learner has to be vigilant and able to express his/her un/knowing to effectively align with the joint activities, including second language learning as social action.

When participants choose not to use the first language, as in the situations investigated in Study 2, in order to do second language learning on more abstract concepts or when breakdowns of intersubjectivity emerge, they seem to discard a resource for meaning-making. A stronger case for the argument made in Study 2 could—possibly—have been made by comparing instances of epistemic discrepancies to similar sequences that involve first language use or code-switching. However, situations where code-switching is used has been extensively investigated in previous research (see, e.g., Firth and Wagner 1997; Cromdal 2000; Kurhila 2001; Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005; Slotte-Lüttge 2005) that show that code-switching is, for example, a way for participants to help each other understand the subject matter of the lessons. Consequently, Study 2 furthers the discussion on the use of the first language in second language educational settings by analyzing how epistemic rights, responsibilities, and expectations seem to be part of both the problem and the solution of sequences in which participants do not code-switch.

The participants in the investigated bilingual settings (and other similarly multilingual settings) bring in a special set of characteristics, knowledge, speaking, hearing, and understanding to the interactional site that may make the site both epistemically more complex as well as make it easier to maintain intersubjectivity with regard to language knowledge. The interactional sites become, in a sense, more complex regarding language knowledge because of the fact that there is not necessarily a clear knowledge asymmetry between participants regarding the co-constructed learning objects that are in the epistemic domain of the second language. Most participants have (at least) some knowledge of both languages, so the determination of who has more or less knowledge and who has the rights to have knowledge of particular linguistic items is a matter of negotiation. Participants' displayed expectations regarding their own and other's knowledge of the languages also play into this epistemic complexity. It is crucial that the analyst distinguishes analytically between the different kinds of knowing that participants express. In some cases, because of diverse knowledge of the second language, participants do not seem to achieve a mutual understanding regarding what it is that the co-participant does and does not know regarding the second language in the local context, as analyzed in Study 2. However, other research indicates that the bilingual character of the settings may enable the participants to more easily maintain and restore intersubjectivity, as they have (at least) two common languages to use as resources in their talk-in-interaction (see, e.g., Hellermann, 2009; Lilja, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Majlesi & Broth, 2012). The languages provide two important linguistic tools for meaning-making and doing second language learning.

Part of the foundation for human sociality—social interaction and cooperation—are expectations of one’s own and others’ knowledge and an orientation to which knowledge that is mutual or not, including expectations on language knowledge (Enfield & Levinson, 2006, pp. 1–3). When participants in the settings under scrutiny do second language learning they also orient to these expectations of knowledge—the epistemic circumstances regarding language knowledge—and talk them into being. That is, from a CA perspective the researcher cannot ‘assume’ that a setting exists. Instead, the analysis of the participants’ contextual social interaction should show how that setting is talked into being by the participants in their situated talk-in-interaction. There is scope for future research to focus on this equivocal nature of bilingual settings. The bilingual settings analyzed in the present thesis seem to include macro-level expectations on language knowledge that appear to permeate the settings on a micro-level. It was not the focus of this thesis to analyze these expectations. Nevertheless, the analyses still touched upon them, but they deserve independent investigation.

### **7.3. A practice for performing second language learning as social action**

The starting point of this thesis is an interest in how participants do second language learning as a joint activity that is oriented-to as learning by the interactants there and then. This section discusses the findings in terms of describing and understanding incongruent interrogative-practices as identifiable interactional practices that participants use to perform second language learning as a sequence of actions.

In the present thesis, the work of “mapping” learning-practices—that others have begun—is continued (e.g., Lee, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Melander, 2012a; Melander, 2012b; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Sahlström, 2009; Sahlström, 2011; Wagner, 2010 to mention a few). For CA to be an independent discipline of everyday human sociality, it needs a more developed perspective on learning in interaction (cf. Sahlström, 2009, p. 109). Several studies on learning, including cognitive studies, agree that learning seems to be a constitutive part of the everyday lives of people and, thus, a part of human sociality (e.g., Csibra & Gergely, 2009; Gergely & Csibra, 2006; Gergely & Csibra, 2013; Gergely, Egyed, & Király, 2007). There is, in other words, a connection between learning and participants’ practices in social interaction. Csibra and Gergely (2009, p. 148) propose that:

...human communication is specifically adapted to allow the transmission of generic knowledge between individuals. Such a communication system, which we call ‘natural pedagogy’, enables fast and efficient social learning of cognitively opaque cultural knowledge that would be hard to acquire relying on purely observational learning mechanisms alone.

CA is not adapted to investigate the cognitive developments of individu-



als. However, if learning is regarded as cognitively opaque in human interaction, CA can help understand how practices—which are oriented-to as learning by participants engaged in joint activities—are organized and accomplished in talk-in-interaction. In other words, a discovering CA venture can help clarify what Csibra and Gergely call a human “natural pedagogy” (2009, p. 148). CA attempts to identify how participants orient to, express, and understand one another’s socially cognitive states (Drew, 1995, p. 79; Seedhouse, 2004). CA acknowledges that there is an inherent embeddedness and intertwinedness between cognition and interaction (Schegloff, 1991, p. 152). By employing a view on learning as social action done by participants “in the first instance” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 165) and by using the epistemics framework (Heritage, 2012b; Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012a; Heritage, 2012d; Stivers et al., 2011) one can better understand how participants do learning in social interaction.

This thesis relies heavily on current CA research on epistemics in interaction (see Chapter 3). However, the way epistemic relationships are managed in everyday conversations may not be immediately applicable to educational settings (Kääntä, 2014; Koole, 2012; Jakonen, 2014; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). For example, epistemic balance is not necessarily the same driving force in everyday interaction as it is in classroom interaction. In the classroom the aim of activities in the institution is usually for one participant to teach and for another to learn. However, in ordinary conversation the epistemic balance is a way for participants to keep each other informed. It is not necessarily the business of the talk-in-interaction. Another aspect related to epistemic balance is that the knowing of an individual in everyday conversation is treated as their own, whereas teachers are established as having epistemic authority over students’ knowledge in classrooms (Koole, 2012). Bilingual second language educational settings may also be considered as more complex epistemic circumstances—than ordinary conversations—in which participants may have access to the oriented-to knowledge, but in which the access may differ due to different epistemic factors (see Chapter 3). Nevertheless, there are shared points of references, and the epistemics framework appears to be appropriate for the analysis of classroom interaction and learning (e.g., Jakonen, 2014a; Jakonen, 2014b; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Koole, 2010; Kääntä, 2014; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Sert, 2013; Sert & Jacknick, 2015).

Few CA studies argue for a view on learning as sets of practices that can be analyzed and conceptualized within CA as social action that participants actively orient to and do (Sahlström, 2011; Lee, 2010). This thesis partly responds to this gap in CA research on second language learning and focuses on whether and how participants actively orient to their situated practices as doing second language learning. The claim is not that all practices that are oriented-to as second language learning by the participants have been mapped in this thesis’ studies. Instead, this thesis is an attempt to use CA

and the epistemics framework to discover and map only a part of the practices that participants use to both perform second language learning as social action and, at the same time, cooperatively achieve and maintain intersubjectivity. That is, this thesis contributes to the CA venture of empirically mapping and describing human social actions.

Epistemic status, participants' background knowledge, is a central element in social interaction and mutual understanding. Epistemics (stance and status) is often treated in a fairly broad perspective in many CA studies on learning. In other words, they (mostly) analyze participants' explicitly expressed epistemic stances and their changes—and trajectories—with regard to the oriented-to learning objects. This approach of employing epistemics has effectively introduced epistemics into the analysis of learning-as-doing and helped in better understanding learning as social action. However, the understanding of how epistemics (stance and status) in conjunction with specific linguistic designs construct different social actions have not yet been extensively studied. Previous research on epistemics in ordinary conversations suggest that the linguistic design seems to be trumped by participants' epistemic statuses and the management of epistemic congruence for determining whether a linguistic design, such as an interrogative, is asserting or requesting information (e.g., Heritage, 2013). The role of the interplay between participants' epistemic statuses, stances, and linguistic designs in the production and recognition of social actions, such as doing learning, appears to be of importance (e.g., Heritage, 2013).

One example of how the interplay between epistemic status and linguistic design makes a difference is the incongruent interrogative when asked by a more knowledgeable participant of a less knowledgeable participant (Study 3, Rusk et al., accepted): the incongruent interrogatives analyzed in Study 3 have similar characteristics to teacher-student interaction in classrooms when the teacher asks incongruent interrogatives to scaffold and support the student's own learning and development. Epistemic incongruence and epistemically asymmetrical positions can be considered normal in the institutional interaction of classrooms (cf. Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; Heritage, 2005). However, epistemic incongruence is not as common in ordinary interaction outside of the classroom or in peer interaction. Nevertheless, Study 3 found that epistemic incongruence and, more specifically, the incongruent interrogative is used as a practice that is part of second language learning both in- and outside of the classroom. It seems to have a central and crucial function in some parts of practices in-and-through which participants do learning.

The incongruent interrogative appears to do two main actions from both the speaker's (oriented-to as K+) and the recipient's (oriented-to as K-) points of view and these actions together constitute a sequence of action, which participants orient to as second language learning. The speaker (1) initiates an instructional sequence, and (2) in-and-through that action pro-

poses reciprocal epistemically asymmetric statuses as part of co-constructing the locally relevant roles as second language teacher and second language learner. The recipient can either (1) align with the projected sequence trajectory by providing possible answers or expressing weak unknowing stances, or (2) resist engaging actively in the proposed instructional sequence by performing disaligning actions, such as expressing a strong unknowing stance.

I subsequently describe how a sequence of learning as social action involving an oriented-to more knowledgeable participant asking an incongruent interrogative appears to be organized. The incongruent interrogative functions as an invitation to do learning: it initiates an instructional sequence and proposes epistemically asymmetric positions on the epistemic gradient for the speaker (K+) in relation to the recipient (K-). The sequence is, then, contingent on whether the recipient knows the answer or not, and on whether the recipient aligns or resists doing learning there and then. If the recipient aligns with doing learning, the sequences are (usually) closed as the recipient's expressed epistemic status of the oriented-to learning object is changed and moved towards a more knowledgeable position on the epistemic gradient. If the recipient resists doing learning, participants can choose between re-initiating the sequence, providing the correct answer, or leaving the sequence and possibly return to it at a later time. Regardless of which sequence trajectory is performed, the sequences are closed when participants agree that a locally relevant—adequate—epistemic balance has been reached. Furthermore, participants' judgment of an adequate epistemic balance in each sequence depends on and is framed by (at least) the character of the oriented-to and co-constructed learning object (conceptual/lexical or difficult/simple) and the assignment that they might be working on (see, e.g., Rusk et al., 2016).

Regarding incongruence and management of epistemics in ordinary conversation outside of classrooms, participants do face-saving activity to avoid claiming a more knowledgeable status of an epistemic domain that the participant does not have epistemic access to in relation to the co-participants (Goffman, 1971; Heritage, 2012a). This involves knowledge of what the co-participant knows or does not know. The incongruent interrogative seems to partly project the second language speaker as knowing. That is, the more knowledgeable participant—the speaker—uttering the incongruent interrogative is then invading on the recipient's epistemic territory. Participants in the data analyzed for Study 3 may utter the incongruent interrogative in a sequential place that makes it, in a sense, reject the less knowledgeable participant's expressed unknowing stance. However, in the analysis done for Study 3, the incongruent interrogative is used by more knowledgeable participants when they read the unknowing epistemic stance of the less knowledgeable participant as weak, and when there is a chance that the less knowledgeable participant might know the answer. The deter-

mination of whether the less knowledgeable participant is truly unknowing regarding the oriented-to learning object is contingent on the social interaction and management of epistemics (see, e.g., Study 2). The participants' epistemic sensitivity seem to provide a basis for more knowledgeable participants to use incongruent interrogatives as a practice to initiate second language learning. The use of incongruent interrogatives by a more knowledgeable participant when the less knowledgeable participant's unknowing stance is weak is a way to give the less knowledgeable participant a chance to do successful learning (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 801) instead of focusing on problems, troubles, and failures. The less knowledgeable participants are not corrected, instead they are allowed to correct themselves and their knowing is then acknowledged and confirmed by a more knowledgeable participant.

The studies in this thesis provide a crude description of one practice (among many)—used by participants to perform learning as social action—and its sequential organization in the social interaction. Doing learning basically involves two or more participants expressing an emergent epistemic imbalance regarding a specific epistemic domain (learning object) and orienting towards reaching a mutually acceptable—locally adequate—epistemic balance; that is, orienting towards moving the established relatively less knowledgeable participant's epistemic status regarding the oriented-to epistemic domain (learning object) towards a relatively more knowledgeable position on the epistemic gradient. Doing learning involves a sequence, which involves an organization of turns-at-talk and social action. In other words, the organization of doing learning is an organization of action. One of the main contributions of the studies in this thesis is the proposition of action, or actions, which compose one of the occurrences of doing (second language) learning. This occurrence includes (among several possible others) an epistemically incongruent interrogative question uttered by a participant that is clearly oriented-to as more knowledgeable, and alignment or resistance (to do learning) from a recipient that is clearly oriented-to as less knowledgeable.

In this thesis, learning is studied as practices through which participants do learning as social action. The analytical scope is on situated practices in specific situations and not on tracking overtly displayed cognition and learning as something participants “embody in talk-in-interaction” (Heritage, 2005, p.188) over a longitudinal period of time. In other words, the focus is not on learning as development over time and space. Further research could attempt to build on the results of this thesis and track a trajectory in learning practices over time regarding a specific, emically co-constructed, and oriented-to learning object. One way of doing this would be to employ a participant-centered approach to provide evidence on the longitudinality of learning and development from a participant's perspective. Additionally, further research could continue mapping practices that participants use to perform learning as social action, as well as analyzing multisemiotic aspects

when participants do learning in interaction. This thesis has mainly focused on the verbal. Further studies could attend more closely to other semiotic resources, such as embodied conduct and bodily action when doing learning. This research could also investigate other learning objects, since not all learning is about knowing. In some educational settings participants orient to skills (or similar) as learning objects.

Several studies agree that learning is a natural part of human everyday sociality. Nevertheless, how it is done and how this “natural pedagogy” is organized in the contingency of social interaction has only recently received some attention in CA studies on learning. This thesis contributes to and furthers previous research on the micro-sequential investigation of learning in interaction by identifying and describing second language learning as everyday social action. In-and-through this venture, the present thesis also contributes to the broader field of CA studies on learning in interaction by contributing to the understanding of how epistemics (stance and status), in conjunction with specific linguistic designs, constructs practices that are used to do second language learning as social action. The role of epistemic status together with the linguistic design of the turns appears to be of importance in the production and recognition of learning as social action in-and-through the use of incongruent interrogatives. Based on a perspective on learning as action that participants do and orient to, it seems that the incongruent interrogative is specifically designed and used as a practice that is part of learning as social action, especially in dyadic interaction where the accountability of who, whether, and what one has learned becomes evident. The studies included in this thesis continue to pave the way for the empirical analysis of learning as observable interactive phenomena that participants actively relate to and choose to do or not do while simultaneously attending to maintaining the shared understanding through the management of the dynamic epistemic relationships. Learning is not (only) a phenomenon that just happens while doing something else; participants can actively and knowingly choose to do learning in concert with each other.

## 8. Sammanfattning

### Introduktion

Under de senaste decennierna har synen på och förståelsen av lärande som ett socialt och interaktivt fenomen fått mer uppmärksamhet och kommit att spela en större roll i den aktuella teoriutvecklingen om lärande. Denna utveckling har beskrivits som ett skifte från en syn på lärande som tilläggande till en syn på lärande som deltagande (Sfard, 2008). Sedan början av 1990-talet har antalet studier som utgått ifrån en social och interaktionell syn på lärande ökat markant. Genom att konceptualisera lärande som ett socialt och interaktivt fenomen placeras lärande i sociala situationer och kontexter då individer, interaktionsdeltagare, är engagerade i gemensamma, sociala handlingar (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1993). Med andra ord ser man en koppling mellan lärande, socialisation och deltagande i interaktion. Lave (1993) beskriver lärande som förändrat deltagande i socialt situerade kontexter och aktiviteter. Ur ett sådant perspektiv ses förändringar i deltagandet i interaktionen som lärande, istället för att se det som ett uttryck för ett tänkt lärande som sker i till exempel individens mentala värld. Följaktligen är lärande något konkret som man kan observera och analysera i den sociala interaktionen. Det är inte enbart något som sker i individens huvud. Det är detta som denna avhandling tar fasta på och genom det bidrar den till att utveckla förståelsen av det konkreta, sociala lärandet i mänsklig interaktion med ett fokus på andraspråkslärande. Men hur kan man hantera något så komplicerat som social interaktion, inte minst andraspråkslärande i interaktion? Och hur kan man beskriva det?

Avhandlingens övergripande syfte är att samtalsanalytiskt beskriva barns och ungas (6–17 år) andraspråkslärande (finska eller svenska) i social interaktion i finländska tvåspråkiga (finsk-svenska) skolkontexter. Avhandlingen utgår ifrån en syn på andraspråkslärande som social handling, som deltagare aktivt gör och förhåller sig till i social interaktion. Analysen utgår ifrån ett starkt samtalsanalytiskt, emiskt, deltagarperspektiv (Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, 2007). Fokus ligger på de interaktionella praktiker, handlingar och aktiviteter som deltagare själva orienterar sig emot som andraspråkslärande samt hur dessa praktiker och aktiviteter är strukturerade och organiserade i den sociala interaktionen där och då. Som data används videoinspelningar av barn och unga i deras skolvardag. Studien är situerad i ett social-interaktionellt perspektiv på språkinläring (se t.ex. Kääntä, 2010; Seedhouse et al., 2010; Firth & Wagner, 2007) och i ett samtalsanalytiskt perspektiv på mänsklig social interaktion som strukturerat och organiserat. Det social-interaktionella perspektivet på språkinläring är ännu i ett tidigt utvecklingsskede, men mängden studier med ett social-interaktionellt perspektiv på lärande ökar stadigt. Fokus ligger på lärande i och genom social interaktion, utan kognitiva anspråk. Social-interaktionella studier om språkligt

lärande studerar lärande på flera olika sätt, men det som alla har gemensamt är att de förlitar sig mer eller mindre på samtalsanalys som analysmetod och de betonar att lärande och utveckling primärt är ett socialt fenomen som är socialt konstruerat i deltagares gemensamma situerade sociala handlingar (t.ex. Hall et al., 2011; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1993; Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Lee, 2010; Melander & Sahlström, 2009; Melander, 2009; Melander, 2012b; Sahlström, 2011). Andraspråkslärande är inte (enbart) ett sekundärt fenomen som sker vid sidan av ett annat primärt fenomen. Andraspråkslärande är (även) sociala handlingar som deltagare gör och förhåller sig till i social interaktion. Detta faktum öppnar för fortsatt utveckling inom området om hur andraspråkslärande görs aktivt i social interaktion. Genom att fokusera görandet av andraspråkslärande där och då det görs kan man bättre förstå det som social handling.

Med denna studie vill jag bidra till den tidigare forskningen om lärande i interaktion genom att bygga vidare på förståelsen om hur andraspråkslärande i interaktion är strukturerat och organiserat i social interaktion. Syftet är att beskriva och förstå de interaktionella praktiker som deltagare använder för att producera sociala handlingar som av deltagarna uppfattas som andraspråkslärande. Avhandlingen består av tre studier: (1) den första studien presenterar och diskuterar olika tillvägagångssätt som samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande använder sig av för att konstruera data och hur relationen mellan datakonstruktion och analys verkar påverka vilken form av analys man kan göra, vilket i sig påverkar resultaten. I centrum av den (2) andra och (3) tredje studien ligger ett fokus på deltagares förhandlingar om egna och andras andraspråkskunskaper samt på hur epistemisk status (gällande andraspråkskunskap) är en del av hur deltagare producerar och uppfattar andraspråkslärande som social handling. Den andra (2) studien fokuserar situationer i vilka kunskapsförhandlingen inte är "stilren". Med andra ord analyseras situationer i vilka missförstånd gällande andraspråkskunskap verkar uppkomma. Den tredje (3) studien analyserar en social praktik, inkongruenta interrogativa frågor, som deltagare verkar använda då de orienterar sig emot att göra andraspråkslärande som social handling samt hur kunskapsförhandlingen verkar vara en del av hur praktiken uppfattas som andraspråkslärande.

## **Finländska tvåspråkiga miljöer**

Avhandlingen diskuterar hur barn och unga förhåller sig till andraspråksanvändning och gör andraspråkslärande utgående ifrån en finländsk tvåspråkig kontext. Med det menar jag att data är inspelat i svenskspråkiga skolor som är belägna i tvåspråkiga områden i Finland. Trots att tvåspråkighet i dessa sammanhang innebär svenska och finska går det att förstå och tillämpa resultaten även i andra tvåspråkiga sammanhang och i annan andraspråks- / främmandespråksundervisning. Men det behövs en beskrivning av den specifika språkliga kontexten för att kunna förstå denna avhandlings re-

sultat och diskussion om deltagares förväntade och uppvisade kunskap i de två språken. Jag inleder med en kort bakgrund om de två nationella språken i Finland och fortsätter med att redogöra för hur deltagare och deras språkkunskap samt förväntningar av egen och andras språkkunskap kan påverkas av dessa tvåspråkiga sammanhang.

Förutom finska är även svenska ett officiellt nationellt språk i Finland och 5,5% av befolkningen på ca 5,2 miljoner talar svenska som förstaspråk. På grund av detta är skolsystemet i Finland delat på språklig grund. I Finland finns det två parallella skolsystem med svenskspråkiga och finskspråkiga skolor, som sträcker sig över alla stadier, från dagvård till utbildning på tredje stadiet (universitet och yrkeshögskolor). I skolorna är undervisningsspråket antingen finska eller svenska. Båda skolsystemen följer samma läroplan och lär ut det andra nationella språket som andra inhemska språk. Språkgrupperna i Finland lever relativt parallella liv (Holm & Londen, 2010). Med andra ord kan svenskspråkiga barn och unga ha väldigt begränsad kontakt till det finska språket om de lever i en svenskspråkig familj och om de går i svenskspråkig skola samt är aktiva i svenskspråkig hobbyverksamhet. I vissa områden i Finland är detta nästan normen, speciellt längs med Finlands västra kust och på Åland. Förväntningarna på kunskaper i finska är sällan höga i dessa områden, även om man skulle kunna tro och utgå ifrån att minoriteten skulle ”bara lära sig” majoritetsspråket på grund av nödvändighet. För övrigt är utgångspunkten oftast den att svenskspråkiga har goda (i alla fall hjälpliga) kunskaper i finska. Finskspråkiga barn och unga förväntas sällan kunna svenska eller ha god kunskap i svenska, eftersom det är ett minoritetsspråk. Finskspråkiga har inte lika god chans att komma i kontakt med det andra inhemska språket, men i vissa områden av Finland, som svenska Österbotten, så är det ändå vanligt att finskspråkiga kommer i kontakt med svenska. Men om de inte har svenskspråkiga släktingar, vänner eller hobbyer så är denna språkkontakt endast marginell. De generella förväntningarna gällande språkkunskap är att finska (majoritetsspråket) är något som de flesta kan och att svenska (minoritetsspråket) är något som få kan. Detta är till en stor del sant speciellt i starkt finskspråkiga områden, som området kring Helsingfors (Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman, 2013). Förväntningarna på språkkunskap är med andra ord olika för de två språken.

Deltagare i mänsklig social interaktion uppmärksammar hur kunskap organiseras socialt i de miljöer som de är del av (t.ex. Goodwin, 2013). I detta ingår en uppmärksamhet till och orientering emot egna och andras språkkunskaper, inklusive förväntningar på dessa. Den språkliga miljön, som undersöks i denna avhandling, karaktäriseras av förväntningar på språkkunskaper och språkanvändning som framträder till en del i deltagarnas interaktion. Dessa förväntningar gör att språkmiljöerna som studeras i denna avhandling inte är de mest ’typiska’ språkmiljöerna som undersökts i övrig forskning om andraspråklärande, i vilka andraspråket oftast är främ-



mande för inlärarna och inte närvarande i deras skol- eller närmiljö (jfr. Cekaite, 2006; Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2010; Jakonen, 2014b; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Majlesi, 2015; He, 2004; Hall et al., 2011; García, 2009). Deltagarna förhåller sig till och agerar dels enligt dessa förväntningar på språkkunskaper då de gör andraspråkslärande. Eftersom avhandlingen fokuserar på deltagares förhandlingar om egna och andras andraspråkskunskaper och hur epistemisk status (gällande andraspråkskunskap) är en del av andraspråkslärande som social handling, så är det nödvändigt att diskutera dessa förväntningar som verkar prägla de studerade klassrummen. Medan deltagare gör andraspråkslärande förhåller de sig även till situationens och kontextens större omständigheter, som inkluderar förväntningar på deltagares språkkunskap samt deltagares uppvisade situerade språkkunskaper. Kontexterna, som studeras, verkar genomsyras av förväntningar och förändrade förväntningar på egen och andras kunskap i de två språken (finska och svenska). Deltagare använder sig av varandras förväntningar på språkkunskap och av varandras aktuella situerade språkkunskap då de gör andraspråkslärande tillsammans. Därför är det av vikt att poängtera särdragen i de tvåspråkiga sammanhangen som undersöks i denna studie, eftersom de påverkar deltagares agerande och andraspråkslärande på mikronivå. Med andra ord bidrar denna studie på en generell nivå, till forskning om andraspråkslärande i social interaktion och på en mer specifik nivå till forskning om andraspråkslärande i tvåspråkiga sammanhang.

## **Samtalsanalys och andraspråkslärande**

Avhandlingens fokus ligger på andraspråkslärande i interaktion som social handling. För att kunna studera lärande i interaktion måste man först och främst studera interaktion och det sociala samspelet individer emellan. Den naturligaste situationen för att studera social interaktion, språk, kognition och därmed även lärande är då flera deltagare utför aktiviteter tillsammans (Goodwin, 2000). Ett sätt att detaljerat studera hur deltagare utför aktiviteter tillsammans är genom samtalsanalys. Traditionellt har samtalsanalys inte använts för att studera lärande, men sedan 2000-talets början har det blivit vanligare att använda samtalsanalys i studier om lärande och andraspråkslärande (Gardner, 2012; Hall et al., 2011; Seedhouse et al., 2010; Kääntä, 2010; Gardner, 2012; Lee, 2010; Sahlström, 2011; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012). Dessa studier, och flera, argumenterar för att samtalsanalysens deltagarperspektiv (emiskt perspektiv) och strukturerade förståelse av mänsklig social interaktion kan bidra till forskningen om lärande i interaktion.

Samtalsanalysen studerar förkroppsligandet av människans vardagliga sociala beteende: hur tal och gester används i handlingar, aktiviteter och beteende i social interaktion (Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, 2007; Sacks, 1995). Med andra ord studerar samtalsanalysen den mänskliga interaktionens organisation och struktur, i vilken lärande ingår. Samtalsanalysens grund-

pelare är dess emiska deltagarperspektiv. Deltagarperspektivet innebär att man som forskare ska minimera sina förutbestämda uppfattningar om hur interaktionsdeltagarna beter sig eller ska bete sig. Analysen ska utgå ifrån den verklighet som syns och hörs i materialet, så som deltagarna uppfattar den och så som de orienterar sig emot den där och då (Schegloff, 1996). Samtalsanalys studerar inte vad deltagarna tänker i deras mentala värld eller vad som sker ”under ytan”, om de inte explicit visar eller säger det. Samtalsanalysens fokus är det som deltagarna de facto gör tillsammans i interaktionen. Genom att enbart utgå ifrån det deltagarna gör, visar och orienterar sig emot i interaktionen, får forskaren verktyg för att beskriva hur händelserna och aktiviteterna utformar sig från en handling till nästa och kan förankra dessa iakttaganden i video- eller ljuddata. Detta kallas för samtalsanalysens bevisföring (på engelska ’next turn proof procedure’, se Sacks & Schegloff, 1974). Bevisföringen är inte enbart ett verktyg för analytikern utan det är (dels) med hjälp av denna bevisföring som interaktionsdeltagarna uppehåller den gemensamma förståelsen i interaktionen. Bevisföringen fungerar för både deltagarna och analytikern som verktyg för att förstå vad deltagarna gör i interaktionen. Bevisföringen, som används i analysen, är inte antaganden, utan iakttaganden som kan bevisas och påvisas i materialet. Interaktion är, med andra ord, synligt och görs av deltagarna så att de hänger med i vad som sker i interaktionen. Det finns en gemensam förståelse, intersubjektivitet, i den sociala interaktionen. Om den inte funnits skulle det vara svårt för deltagarna att förstå varandra och göra meningsfulla aktiviteter och handlingar tillsammans.

Största delen av den samtalsanalytiska forskningen om andraspråkslärande (och språkligt lärande) studerar inte lärande i sig, vilket är syftet med denna studie, utan de argumenterar på basis av noggranna empiriska analyser för ett samband mellan social interaktion och lärande (se t.ex. Björk-Willén, 2006; Cekaite, 2006; Kääntä, 2010; Lilja, 2010; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009a; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005). Dessa studiers fokus ligger på den sociala interaktionen och dess sekventiella organisation, interaktionens struktur. De beskriver, till exempel, hur det i den sociala interaktionen finns tillfällen och situationer i vilka lärande kan ske. Med andra ord är deras fokus inte lärande i sig. En mindre grupp samtalsanalytiska studier studerar andraspråkslärande genom att fokusera på det som samtalsanalysen är bäst på; att beskriva interaktionens struktur, den sekventiella organisationen (t.ex. Wootton, 1997). En växande grupp samtalsanalytiska studier om andraspråkslärande har bidragit till denna form av lärandestudier (t.ex. Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2009; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009a; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009b; Young & Miller, 2004; Cekaite, 2007; Gardner, 2007; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015). Dessa studier identifierar ett samtalsanalytiskt fenomen som analyseras över en längre tid (till exempel reparationer) och förklarar förändringarna i användningen av fenomenet som sker över en viss tid som

lärande. Dessa studier har bidragit till en bättre förståelse av interaktionell kompetens i samband med andraspråkslärande, men ett problem ur ett emiskt deltagarperspektiv är att lärandet och lärandeobjektet förblir etiskt definierade av forskaren. Hur deltagare orienterar sig emot ett lärandeobjekt, som inte är ett av forskaren definerat samtalsanalytiskt fenomen och hur de gör lärande som social handling är ännu till en stor del outforskat.

Lee (2010) efterlyser forskning om hur lärande görs i interaktion då han säger att man för att förstå språkligt lärande behöver studera hur det görs. De flesta studierna om lärande i interaktion beskriver inte hur lärande görs i social interaktion. Merparten av studierna som använt samtalsanalys i studier om lärande i interaktion har använt samtalsanalys som ett verktyg för att komma åt och synliggöra social interaktion, som sedan förklarats och definierats med hjälp av andra teoretiska perspektiv än samtalsanalys. Det har visat sig vara fruktbart och det har hjälpt i förståelsen om lärande i interaktion, men man kan även arbeta inom samtalsanalysens perspektiv i studier om lärande. På det viset skulle man inte behöva definiera och beskriva lärande med hjälp av andra perspektiv, utan istället kunna samtalsanalytiskt hävda att lärande är social handling som interaktionsdeltagare gör. Lee (2010) diskuterar hur samtalsanalys kan användas i forskning om andraspråkslärande. Enligt Lee är inte tal-i-interaktion tillräckligt pålitligt för att kunna avgränsa lärandeobjekten. Tal-i-interaktion är för ovisst och föränderligt från taltur till taltur för att kunna ge forskare tydliga indikationer om lärandeobjekt. Samtalsanalysen kan bidra med forskning om fenomenet lärande ur ett deltagarperspektiv om man i analysen behandlar interaktionens föränderlighet som ett centralt begrepp (Lee, 2010). På det viset kan samtalsanalysen bättre bidra till förståelsen av lärande i interaktion än om man forskarcentrerat definierar till exempel reparationer som ett lärandeobjekt. Genom samtalsanalys får man syn på interaktionsdeltagares föränderliga sätt att göra mening i interaktionen genom vilka görandet av lärande upptäcks, representeras och förverkligas.

Om meningen med den pedagogiska forskningen är att hjälpa språkligt lärande, måste man studera hur lärande görs och föranleds (Lee, 2010). Det finns aktuella studier som börjat utforska detta område inom forskningen om andraspråkslärande (t.ex. Lee, 2010; Melander, 2012a; Melander, 2012b; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Sahlström, 2009; Sahlström, 2011; Wagner, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Rusk et al., 2016; Rusk, Sahlström & Pörn, accepted). De skiljer sig alla från varandra i fråga om data och fokus av analysen, men det de har gemensamt är att de uppfattar lärande som social handling som interaktionsdeltagare aktivt gör tillsammans. De hävdar att lärande kan studeras utifrån ett samtalsanalytiskt perspektiv. Lärande anses då vara handling i sig under vilken deltagarna är explicit orienterade emot förändring och utveckling och att aktiviteten kan definieras och beskrivas genom samtalsanalys så länge man i analysen kommer ihåg att ta i beaktande den mänskliga sociala interaktionens föränderlighet. Detta faktum

öppnar för fortsatt utveckling inom området, inte minst i hur barn och unga gör andraspråkslärande sinsemellan.

Sahlström (2011) utvecklar argumentet och presenterar empiriska bevis på två sjuåriga flickor som gör andraspråkslärande utanför klassrummet. Innehållet som flickorna orienterar sig emot som det som ska läras, lärandeobjekt, är att räkna på engelska. Resultaten visar att de fyra situationer under vilka flickorna gör lärande och orienterar sig emot att lära sig räkna på engelska karaktäriseras av en orientering emot longitudinalitet och kunskapsasymmetrier samt uttryckta epistemiska hållningar. Ett sätt att visa och orientera sig emot varandras kunskaper om olika aktuella innehåll i det sociala samspelet är genom att uttrycka sin epistemiska hållning (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d; Karlsson, 2006; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Linell, 2009; Du Bois, 2007). Interaktionsdeltagarna övervakar aktivt varandras förståelse och för att göra detta uttrycker de sin epistemiska hållning. Det är en del av bevisproceduren och genom att i analysen inkludera språk, innehåll och uppvisad, uttryckt kunskap, som integrerade i interaktion kan man empiriskt studera en ”alternativ” form av kognition. Detta kallas för ”socialt delad kognition” och det är en reflexivt situerad process skapad i interaktion mellan två eller flera individer (t.ex. Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). Med andra ord är det något som interaktionsdeltagarna gör där och då. De visar för varandra vad de vet och inte vet och oftast är det någon som vet mera än någon annan; det finns en kunskapsasymmetri (Heritage, 2012c; Heritage, 2012d).

Deltagarna kan orientera sig emot den här asymmetrin och använda den som en resurs då de gör lärande. Kunskapsasymmetrierna synliggörs i samtalen genom att deltagarna beskriver för varandra, på ganska omfattande sätt, vad de kan och vet om det aktuella innehållet. Med andra ord uttrycker de explicit sin epistemiska hållning. Att uttrycka sin epistemiska hållning verkar vara särskilt vanligt i undervisning och lärandesituationer (Melander & Sahlström, 2010). Om inte deltagarna gjorde detta (på olika sätt) skulle ingen i samtalet veta något om vad de andra kan och vet. Då skulle det vara svårt att göra lärande, eftersom deltagarna inte skulle veta hur mycket de behöver förklara om innehållet och om de kanske skulle kunna få reda på något nytt om innehållet av en annan deltagare. Denna syn står i motsats till uppfattningen om kognition som ett fenomen som existerar i individens mentala liv. Genom att betrakta det innehåll som deltagarna orienterar sig emot och deltagarnas uppvisade kunskap om det relevanta innehållet som en integrerad del av den sociala interaktionen så kan förändringar i innehållets karaktär förstås som förändring i deltagande, som med andra ord kan förstås som lärande. Det är med hjälp av samtalsanalysens epistemiska ramverk som forskaren (och deltagare) får verktyg för att kunna hantera dessa uppvisade förändringar i det innehåll deltagarna orienterar sig emot och analysera den noggrant.

## Metodologi och metod

Samtalsanalytikerns uppgift är att ”upptäcka” regelbundenheter i mänsklig social interaktion som tidigare varit oupptäckta (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a). En samtalsanalytiker ska dock inte enbart identifiera interaktionella fenomen, utan även beskriva och analysera dem noggrant. För att göra detta har samtalsanalysen utarbetat en uppsättning av analysmetoder och tekniker som särskiljer samtalsanalysen från andra socialvetenskapliga discipliner som också studerar naturligt förekommande tal, språkanvändning och social interaktion med hjälp av ljud- eller videoinspelningar (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). Åtminstone fem olika aspekter gör samtalsanalysen unik i de andra socialvetenskapernas sällskap. Samtalsanalysens bidrag till forskningen i och om social interaktion ligger i dessa aspekter (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012; Drew & Heritage, 2006). De är: (1) den teoretiska utgångspunkten om ordning och struktur i mänsklig interaktion, (2) ett fokus på handlingar, (3) datakonstruktionen, (4) transkriptionssystemet och (5) den induktiva analysmetoden.

Den första aspekten om (1) att all interaktion är strukturerad och organiserad baserar sig på ett antagande om att mänsklig social interaktion är möjligt eftersom deltagare delar vissa kommunikativa kompetenser, inklusive kunskap om strukturerna och normerna som gäller den sociala organisationen. Denna kunskap är inte något som deltagare är medvetna om, men oberoende är den påtaglig och observerbar för både deltagare och meddeltagare då de etablerar och upprätthåller en gemensam förståelse om vad de säger och gör då de är engagerade i gemensamma sociala aktiviteter (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2012; Sidnell, 2012a). Den andra aspekten (2) innebär att samtalsanalysen är handlingsorienterad. Målet med analysen är att upptäcka och uttryckligen beskriva de sociala praktiker som deltagare använder sig av då de producerar och förstår varandras sociala handlingar (Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a). Centralt för denna form av analys är bevisföringen: hur en deltagare uppfattar sin meddeltagares yttranden eller andra sociala handlingar (Sacks & Schegloff, 1974; Drew & Heritage, 2006; Sidnell, 2012a). För att uppnå samtalsanalysens mål behövs (3) naturalistiskt data av naturligt förekommande social interaktion (Stivers & Sidnell, 2012). Samtalsanalysens emiska deltagarperspektiv förutsätter användningen av oredigerat, icke-experimentellt, naturligt inspelat ljud- eller videodata (Mondada, 2012b). Hela kedjan i datainsamlingen (t.ex. inspelning, urval, transkription) är del av analysen och forskaren konstruerar data då olika val görs vid olika tillfällen i kedjan, därav användningen av termen datakonstruktion. Samtalsanalysen är intresserad av de små beståndsdelarna som är en del av social interaktion och gör en gemensam förståelse mellan människor möjlig. För att fånga det som deltagare gör och orienterar sig emot på en mikronivå krävs ett rigoröst och detaljerat (4) system för transkription (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012). Jefferson (Jefferson, 2004) skapade en början till detta system, som framställer både verbal och icke-verbal akti-

vitet samt intonation, emfas och så vidare. Transkriptionssystemet har förändrats och utvecklas vidare i och med att ny teknik ger nya möjligheter till andra former av framställning och eftersom ny forskning kräver nya former av framställning (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012).

Den femte (5) aspekten som särskiljer samtalsanalysen är dess induktiva analysmetod. Samtalsanalysens analysmetod grundar sig på att interaktion och tal-i-interaktion är strukturerat och att bidrag till samtal är kontextualiserade, formade av kontexten och kontextförnyande. Med andra ord är social interaktion och samtal situerade och analysen kan och ska inte dekontextualisera och ta den analyserade interaktionen ur kontext. Istället ska analytikern anamma ett emiskt deltagarperspektiv, eftersom deltagare i samtal inte gör sina handlingar i tomrum, utan de förhåller sig till den verklighet de befinner sig i där och då. Kontexten byggs upp av deltagarna tillsammans med sina meddeltagare, de talar fram situationen och kontexten. Bidrag till interaktionen är formade av kontexten och kan vara svår-förståeliga för någon som inte har en uppfattning av i vilken kontext de har uttalats. De kan med andra ord missförstås om kontexten inte är klar. Samtalsbidragen är kontextförnyande i den mening att de kan förhandla, pröva eller konstruera ny kontext. Den samtalsanalytiska analysmetoden innebär även att inte förbise någon detalj i samtalet som något irrelevant eller som ett misstag och analysen ska alltid utgå ifrån det empiriska materialet och grunda analysen i empirin. På grund av samtalsanalysens 'upptäckande' karaktär ska analytikern öppet se på materialet och inte ha förutbestämda idéer om vad man söker, utan låta materialet tala för sig själv. Därefter ska man välja ett urval, eftersom transkriberingen och mikroanalysen av flera timmar av videomaterial kan bli för mycket. Det är dessutom inte alltid nödvändigt att transkribera och analysera allt. Inom kvalitativa studier, som samtalsanalytiska studier sållar sig till, finns det inte något rätt eller fel svar för hur man börjar analysera materialet. Det viktiga är att anamma ett samtalsanalytiskt förhållningssätt och se vilka upptäckter man kan göra i det material man arbetar med. (Seedhouse, 2004; Psathas, 1995; Schegloff, 1999; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell, 2012a)

## **Datakonstruktion**

Datainsamlingen är genomförd i tre olika forskningsprojekt. Datakonstruktionen av det empiriska materialet kan uppfattas som "innehållsfokuserat" och till en del "deltagarfokuserat" (på engelska content-centered och participant-centered, Rusk et al., 2014). Data som används i den andra och en del av data i den tredje artikeln är innehållsfokuserat. Denna form av datakonstruktion fokuserar ett innehåll eller en interaktionell praktik i en specifik omgivning. Forskningsintresset i en dylik datakonstruktion är den sociala interaktionen kring/om ett specifikt innehåll eller hur en specifik interaktionell praktik görs. Utgångspunkten är att finna situationer där innehållet framkommer eller där praktiken görs i den sociala interaktionen för att

kunna studera lärandet av innehållet eller praktiken. Denna datakonstruktion lämpar sig för att studera interaktionella praktiker kopplade till lärande av ett innehåll eller en praktik och därmed förstå hur deltagare förändrar sitt deltagande i relation till innehållet eller praktiken i den sociala interaktionen. En del av data i den tredje artikeln är mera deltagarfokuserat i form av inspelningar, men analysen är innehållsfokuserad. Deltagarfokuserade studier fokuserar och följer en deltagare och hans interaktion i och mellan olika omgivningar. Det som den specifika deltagaren (oftast en individ) orienterar sig emot är i analysens och inspelningens fokus. Forskningsintresset är, med andra ord, utvecklingen och lärandet som en deltagare är del av (och gör). Utgångspunkten är ett deltagarperspektiv på lärande (Sfard, 2008) och ett syfte att bättre förstå hur lärande görs varsomhelst och närsomhelst i olika vardagliga situationer som fokusdeltagaren är del av. Målet är att fånga en holistisk förståelse av en fokusdeltagares vardagsliv och lärande i vardagen. För att summera: avhandlingen utgår ifrån en starkt innehållsfokuserad datakonstruktion, men ingen datakonstruktion i samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion är enkom det ena eller det andra, därför har även deltagarfokuserade videoinspelningar inkluderats i avhandlingens tredje studie. Men all data har analyserats ur ett innehållsfokuserat perspektiv.

En del av materialet som används i avhandlingens andra artikel är insamlat inom forskningsprojektet Finska i och utanför skolan (Pörn & Norrman, 2011; Pörn & Törni, 2010; Rusk & Pörn, 2013). Syftet med projektet var att kartlägga och undersöka andraspråksinlärning och andraspråksanvändning i en klubbverksamhet ("Finskklubb") som arrangerades utanför skoltid i en svenskspråkig skola i en svenskdominerad miljö i Finland. Datainsamlingen för denna studie består av sammanlagt fyra omgångar av datainsamling under en veckas tid under det första verksamhetsåret, 2008–2009: (november 2008, december 2008, februari 2009 och april 2009). Materialet består av ungefär 12 timmar film. Videoinspelningarna fokuserar barngruppen bestående av sju barn. Inget specifikt barn har följts, utan datainsamlingen fokuserade lärarens interaktion med barnen. Data spelades in med en kamera och utan extern mikrofon. En forskare filmade hela sessionerna och försökte fånga interaktionen mellan läraren och barnen. Forskaren skuggade läraren för att så väl som möjligt fånga alla situationer i vilka läraren interagerar med barnen.

En del av materialet i andra och tredje artikeln är inspelat inom forskningsprojektet Klasstandem. Syftet med projektet var att öka kunskapen om och beskriva interaktionen mellan svensk- och finskspråkiga studeranden under finsk- respektive svensklektionerna inom klasstandemkurserna genom videoobservationer i klass. Videoinspelningarna har gjorts under fyra klasstandemkurser från våren 2013 till hösten 2014. Hälften av studerandena i kurserna är svensktalande och hälften finsktalande. Lärarna organiserade studerandena i tandempar, som består av en svensktalande och en finsktalande studerande. Alla studerande var nybörjare i deras andraspråk

och arbetade i samma par genom kurserna. Det data som används i denna avhandling består av 95 timmar och innehåller sex olika tandempar. I datainsamlingen användes två små GoPro-kameror vid inspelningarna av den sista kursen. De små kamerorna kunde lätt fästas vid tandemparens bord och ingen extern mikrofon behövdes för att fånga talet. De andra kurserna filmades med en handhållen kamera på stativ och en extern mikrofon för att spela in talet.

Den andra delen av materialet i tredje artikeln är videoinspelningar av sjuåriga flerspråkiga barns hela vardag i skolan. Det data som används i tredje artikeln är på två barn (Sara och Simon) som filmats inom forskningsprojektet FLIS (Flerspråkiga barns lärande och identitet i och utanför skola). Sara (filmad 2008) går i en svensk förskola och eftis i en tvåspråkig stadsort i södra Finland där finskan är majoritetsspråket. Hon talar svenska med sina kompisar och i hemmet med syskon och föräldrar, men hon använder även engelska och swahili ibland med föräldrarna. Simon (filmad 2006) går på årskurs 1 i en svensk skola. Han är i en CLIL klass i vilken de använder sig av både svenska och engelska som undervisningsspråk (Sjöholm & Björklund, 1999). Han bor i en del av svenska Österbotten som präglas av en finsk-svensk tvåspråkighet. Sara spelades in på våren 2008 och Simon spelades in på hösten 2006. Båda barnen spelades in enligt samma metod. De spelades in under ca en veckas tid både i skola och eftis. Med andra ord är inspelningarna inriktade på barnen och deras aktiviteter. Tillsammans är det ungefär 85 timmar videodata. Barnen filmades i skolan av en forskare som följde dem hela skoldagen och barnen hade bärbara mikrofoner på sig för att fånga upp ljudet där de rör sig utan att kameran behövde stå tätt intill. Bildkvaliteten varierar enligt situation och det finns även kortare snuttar där fokusbarnet inte syns, men ljudet hörs. Det är inte alltid möjligt att få med blickar och gester, men genom att ha ett nära fokus på eleven kan man fånga in elevens interaktion med andra på ett tillfredsställande sätt.

Alla deltagare i de olika videoinspelningarna skrev under tillståndsblanketter som innehöll tre olika alternativ om hur det data som de syns och hörs på får användas: (1) för undervisnings- och forskningssammanhang, (2) inom projektet och i forskningssammanhang eller (3) inte alls. De som inte ville delta i projektet måste man försöka undvika att filma genom att lämna dem utanför bild då de befann sig i närheten av deltagaren som var i fokus för inspelningarna. Under korta perioder var detta omöjligt och då måste man antingen obemärkt stoppa inspelandet eller radera det materialet i efterskott. Namnen på de deltagande barnen och vuxna har fingerats. Vid videoinspelning och speciellt vid videoinspelning av minderåriga barn krävs noggrann etisk reflektion av forskaren, i synnerhet då man följer deltagare en hel dag och fäster en mikrofon på barnet som fångar upp allt det säger. Deltagarna i allt inspelat material var medvetna om att allt ljud fångas upp och att de kan säga nej och vägra bli inspelade. Deltagarna i data visade explicit en tydlig medvetenhet om att de blir inspelade. De gånger någon



utomstående frågade något om inspelningarna visade fokusdeltagarna att de förstod vad det handlade om och förklarade oproblematiskt om varför de spelar in. Deltagarna tycktes i allmänhet fort glömma bort kameran och verkade oberörda över att bli inspelade och deras tal föreföll naturligt.

## Sammanfattning av studierna

Denna avhandling består av tre studier av vilka två är empiriska och en diskuterar olika studiers förhållnings- och tillvägagångssätt gällande datakonstruktionen i samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion. Följande sammanfattar jag kort varje studies resultat och fortsätter i därpå följande del med en diskussion om studiernas resultat.

**Studie 1: Rusk, F., Pörn, M., Sahlström, F., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2014). Perspectives on using video recordings in conversation analytical studies on learning in interaction. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 38(1), 39–55.**

Den första studien beskriver olika former av datakonstruktion i samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion och hur dessa olika former verkar generera och leda till olika resultat gällande lärande. Samtalsanalytiska studiers data är naturalistiskt. Med andra ord handlar det om video- eller ljudinspelningar av naturligt förekommande interaktion. En viktig del av datainsamlingen är att inte påverka inspelningarna så mycket, utan försöka fånga den naturliga sociala interaktionen ur ett emiskt deltagarperspektiv; så som deltagarna uppfattar situationen där och då. En viktig poäng med den samtalsanalytiska datakonstruktionen är just det att det är en ”konstruktion”. Man samlar eller spelar inte enbart in något som är en objektiv sanning för senare analys. Forskaren gör val under alla stadier av datakonstruktionen, från valet av situationer eller miljöer som spelar in och valet av teknisk utrustning till urval av situationer för närmare analys och nivån av transkription samt slutligen valet av analys exempel som inkluderas i studiens rapport. Hela kedjan i datakonstruktionen är del av analysen: forskaren konstruerar data då olika val görs vid olika tillfällen i kedjan. Med andra ord är det viktigt att uppmärksamma detta bakomliggande syfte: relationen mellan datakonstruktion och analys. Metoddiskussionen i samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion tar sällan upp denna relation mellan datakonstruktion och analys samt dess inverkan på resultaten. Studie 1 visar att samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion kan delas in i tre olika kategorier, beroende på deras tillvägagångssätt att konstruera data: (1) omgivningsfokuserat (eng. setting-centered approach), (2) deltagarfokuserat (eng. participant-centered approach) och (3) innehållsfokuserat (eng. content-centered approach). (Rusk et al., 2014)

De (1) omgivningsfokuserade studierna fokuserar på en omgivning (oftast klassrum) och studerar de interaktionella och sociala praktikerna samt

den sekventiella organisationen i den specifika omgivningen (setting) (t.ex. Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008; Käätä, 2010; Lee, 2010; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 2004; Young & Miller, 2004). Forskningsintresset i dessa studier är den sociala organisationen i en specifik omgivning för att analysera och definiera lärandetillfällen med hjälp av till exempel social-interaktionella eller sociokulturella teorier om lärande. Utgångspunkten är att studera omgivningar där lärande kan ske (klassrum), hur de är socialt organiserade och genom det analysera potentiella lärandetillfällen. Dessa studier har bidragit stort till det växande intresset för lärande ur ett CA perspektiv (Gardner, 2012). De (2) deltagarfokuserade studierna fokuserar och följer en deltagare och spelar in den sociala interaktionen i och mellan olika omgivningar ur deltagarens perspektiv. Det som den specifika deltagaren orienterar sig emot är i analysens fokus (t.ex. Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Sahlström, 2011; Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge & Rusk, 2010; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012; Wootton, 1997). Forskningsintresset i dessa studier är utvecklingen och lärandet som en deltagare är del av (och gör) i social interaktion. Utgångspunkten är ett deltagarperspektiv på lärande (Sfard, 2008) och ett syfte att bättre förstå hur lärande görs varsohelst och närsomhelst i olika vardagliga situationer som fokusdeltagaren är del av. Målet är att fånga en fokusdeltagares vardagsliv och lärande i vardagen ur ett holistiskt perspektiv. De (3) innehållsfokuserade studierna fokuserar ett innehåll eller en interaktionell praktik i en specifik omgivning (t.ex. Ekström, 2012; Lindwall, 2008; Lindwall & Lymer, 2011; Lindwall & Ekström, 2012; Lymer, 2010). Forskningsintresset i dessa studier är den sociala interaktionen kring eller om ett specifikt innehåll eller hur en specifik interaktionell praktik görs. Utgångspunkten är att finna situationer där innehållet framkommer eller situationer där praktiken görs i den sociala interaktionen för att kunna studera deltagares lärande av innehållet eller praktiken.

De ovannämnda tillvägagångssätten verkar generera olika resultat. De omgivningsfokuserade studierna identifierar potentiella lärandetillfällen i den studerade omgivningen (klassrummet) för att förstå lärande och kognitionsprocesser i klassrum. De deltagarfokuserade studierna studerar longitudinellt lärande ur en deltagares perspektiv för att förstå och spåra öppet visade kognitionsprocesser och lärande som något deltagare uttrycker i social interaktion. De innehållsfokuserade studierna studerar interaktionella praktiker kopplade till lärande av ett innehåll eller en praktik för att förstå hur deltagare förändrar sitt deltagande i relation till innehållet/praktiken i den sociala interaktion. Ingen av studierna (som presenteras som exempel i Studie 1) profilerar sig som omgivnings-, deltagar- eller innehållsfokuserade och ingen av dem är fullständiga exempel på ett av de olika tillvägagångssätten. Med andra ord har alla studier aspekter av de tre olika tillvägagångssätten, men olika sätt att konstruera data verkar innefatta olika analyser och därmed olika resultat både i relation till förståelsen av lärande och kognition och i relation till de emiska (deltagarperspektiv) utgångspunkterna.

Alla dessa studier är samtalsanalytiska studier om lärande i interaktion och anammar ett emiskt deltagarperspektiv på data och analys. Ändå är utgångspunkterna olika och därmed blir fokus och resultaten olika samt synen på och förståelsen av lärande i interaktion. Orsaken till denna indelning är att uppvisa hur datakonstruktionens design påverkar valet av analytiskt fokus, som i sin tur påverkar vilka aspekter av lärande som studeras samt vilka och hurdana resultat man kommer fram till. Det finns en ansevärd variation i vilka aspekter som fokuseras i data, vilket påverkar och gör den efterföljande analytiska betoningen förutsägbar. Denna kategorisering uppvisar vikten av att i planeringen av datakonstruktionen ta i beaktande vilket intresse av och vilket perspektiv på lärande i interaktion man har.

**Studie 2: Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016). The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 184–205.**

Den andra studien fokuserar på situationer i vilka en andraspråksinlärare har svårt att förstå den aktuella aktiviteten eller uppgiften (vilket innebär en förståelse av andraspråket) och ber om hjälp av en deltagare med kunskapsmässigt högre status (K+ deltagare: lärare och förstaspråkstalare). Studien undersöker om och i så fall hur användningen av andraspråket verkar påverka andraspråkslärande som social handling i dessa situationer. Syftet är att bättre förstå hur hanteringen av deltagares relativa dynamiska förhållanden gällande språkkunskap påverkar möjligheter till att upprätthålla gemensam förståelse och göra andraspråkslärande.

Frågar man språklärare hur man organiserar effektiv andraspråksinlärning förknippas det ofta med en princip om att så gott som enbart använda andraspråket i språkklassrummet (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2010). En orsak till denna syn på effektiv språkundervisning kan vara att språkbaserad baserar sig på en exklusiv användning av andraspråket för att exponera studerandena till så mycket andraspråk som möjligt och för att språkbaserad rapporteras som väldigt framgångsrika i fråga om språkundervisning (t.ex. Krashen, 1982; Krashen, 1984; McMillan & Turnbull, 2010). Synen på användningen av förstaspråket blir då att det minskar exponeringen till andraspråket. Denna studie tar fasta på detta genom att studera hur deltagare hanterar situationer i vilka de reparerar problem i den gemensamma förståelsen genom att använda andraspråket. I dessa situationer uppkommer det olika orienteringar emot första- och andraspråkkunskap och olika förväntningar på vem som har vilken språkkunskap. Situationer i vilka deltagare inte kodväxlar (använder sig av det andra gemensamma språket) skiljer sig från situationer som innehåller kodväxling, eftersom deltagare måste förlita sig på delvis begränsad kunskap i andraspråket. Om den gemensamma förståelsen inte kan upprätthållas eller repareras kan det hindra och försvåra andraspråksinlärning (Markee, 2000; Hall et al., 2011; Hellermann, 2009;

Kasper, 2009; Seedhouse, 2004). Synen på att förstaspråksanvändning skulle försvåra effektiv andraspråksinlärning har luckrats upp till en del genom att sociokulturell forskning om språkinlärning och språkanvändning visar att förstaspråksanvändning egentligen hjälper andraspråksinlärare i situationer då kunskaperna i andraspråket inte räcker till (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Behan et al., 1997; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Kern, 1994; Macaro, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Thoms et al., 2005).

Resultaten visar att det finns goda möjligheter till att göra andraspråkslärande om innehållet är bekant från tidigare. Men användningen av andraspråket för att göra lärande om mer abstrakta koncept och om språkliga aspekter som inte enbart är lexikala och/eller kontextbundna verkar skapa problem. Det verkar kunna uppstå epistemisk diskrepans, missförstånd, mellan förväntningarna på språkkunskap, faktisk språkkunskap och förståelse då det gäller andraspråket och/eller den aktuella uppgiften. I vissa sammanhang kan deltagarnas skiftande språkkunskap och förväntningar på språkkunskap leda till problem i att uppnå en gemensam förståelse av den aktuella uppgiften och det aktuella lärandeobjektet. Deltagarna angriper uppgiften ur vitt skilda utgångspunkter och har olika förståelse av vad som förväntas av dem för att göra uppgiften samt hur uppgiften ska lösas. Dessa situationer kan försvåras ytterligare av att deltagarna använder sig av andraspråket för att reda ut missförstånden. Med andra ord försvåras användningen av andraspråket deltagarnas möjligheter att i samförstånd förhandla med varandra om vad de kan eller inte kan.

En annan aspekt som framkommer är att deltagare kan fortsätta med uppgifter och aktiviteter utan att veta eller förstå alla språkliga delar av dem. Deltagarna kan med andra ord bara konstatera att ett svar (ofta ett ord) är korrekt för att färdigställa uppgiften, men andraspråkstalarens förståelse av ordet och vad det betyder behöver inte fastställas eller försäkras. Deltagare kan göra uppgifter och vara fullvärdiga deltagare i andraspråksklassrummet utan att behöva uppnå epistemisk balans, utan istället i en mer mekanisk anda göra och färdigställa uppgifterna. På så vis kan en andraspråkstalare gå vidare till nästa uppgift, utan att kunna och förstå vad svaret innebär eller betyder. En orsak till att detta är möjligt i dessa situationer är att det finns en K+ deltagare närvarande, en deltagare med mer kunnig epistemisk status, som den mindre kunniga andraspråkstalaren kan förlita sig på. Det verkar som att K+ deltagaren i dessa situationer anser att kunskapen inte är nödvändig för att gå vidare och göra uppgiften och/eller att andraspråkstalarens kunskaper eller förväntade kunskaper inte är tillräckliga för att kunna göra andraspråkslärande om det aktuella mer abstrakta lärandeobjektet. Studien visar hur principen för användningen av andraspråket kan leda till att andraspråkslärande temporärt förhindras eller till att andraspråkslärande förblir på en mer ytlig nivå och att enbart den mekaniska uppgiften blir gjord. Då deltagare, i dessa situationer, väljer att inte använda sig av det andra språket som de har gemensamt, så väljer de bort ett verktyg i att uppehålla

gemensam förståelse och göra andraspråkslärande. Frågan är, med andra ord, inte om man ska använda förstaspråket eller ej, utan istället handlar det om när och hur man kan använda de olika språken för att mer effektivt stöda andraspråkslärande som social handling.

**Studie 3: Rusk, F., Sahlström, F., & Pörn, M. (accepted). Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: Incongruent interrogative-practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction. *Linguistics and Education*.**

Den tredje studiens övergripande syfte är att analysera hur deltagare (elever) använder sig av epistemiskt inkongruenta interrogativa frågor, ”lärarfrågor”, i social interaktion då de verkar orientera sig emot att göra andraspråkslärande? Är inkongruenta interrogativa frågor en del av de sociala praktiker som deltagare använder sig av då de gör andraspråkslärande i interaktion? Situationerna som analyseras karaktäriseras av en deltagare (orienteras emot som relativt mer kunnig) som frågar en meddeltagare (orienteras emot som relativt mindre kunnig) en inkongruent interrogativ fråga (en fråga som frågeställaren redan vet svaret till) om ett lärandeobjekt som relaterar till andraspråkskunskap.

Forskning inom flera olika områden, inklusive samtalsanalytiska studier, visar att lärare ofta ställer frågor till vilka de redan vet svaren och dessa frågor verkar vara en viktig del av klassrummens interaktion, till exempel är de en viktig del av IRE-sekvenser (t.ex. Hargreaves, 2012; Lee, 2010; Long & Sato, 1983; Macbeth, 2003; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Searle, 1969; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Waring, 2012; Radford et al., 2011; Margutti, 2006; Margutti, 2010 med flera). Dessa frågor kan med samtalsanalysens epistemiska analysramverk benämnas som inkongruenta interrogativer (Drew, 2012; Heritage, 2013; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Heinemann et al., 2011). Läraren ställer dessa frågor för att få reda på vad eleverna förstår eller inte förstår och om de lärt sig eller ej. Med inkongruenta interrogativer kan läraren även ”kontra” om en elev ställer en fråga om något som läraren anser att eleven kan själv eller som eleven kan ta reda på själv (McHoul, 1990). Inkongruenta interrogativer verkar vara en viktig del av den sociala organisationen i klassrum och andra pedagogiska institutioner samt en viktig del av det som klassrummet är organiserat för att stöda; nämligen lärande (t.ex. Kitzinger, 2012; Macbeth, 2004; Schegloff et al., 2002). Men dessa frågor har även kritiserats för att inte vara ”kommunikativa”, särskilt i andraspråksklassrum som ska lära ut språket genom kommunikativa metoder (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Gibbons, 1998; Markee, 1995) och för att de verkar leda till att deltagare socialt konstruerar situationer som kan till och med förhindra handlingar som främjar andraspråkslärande (Markee, 2004).

Inkongruenta interrogativer undersöks oftast som frågor ställda av läraren, men även elever kan fråga inkongruenta interrogativer av varandra. Få

studier har fokuserat på att studera hur elever ställer dessa frågor till varandra. Tidigare forskning visar att elever gör andraspråkslärande med varandra i klassrum och även utanför skolan och i hemmet (t.ex. Gardner, 2012; Mori, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004; Sahlström et al., 2013). Elever är med andra ord aktiva i sitt eget och andras lärande och instruerar varandra (Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Jakonen, 2014b; Jakonen, 2014a; Lilja, 2010; Lilja, 2014; Sahlström, 2011; Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge et al., 2012). Men hur elever skulle använda inkongruenta interrogativer som en del av andraspråkslärande har inte studerats. Eftersom inkongruenta interrogativer verkar vara en så fundamental del av lärande i klassrum mellan läraren och elever, så vore det även av intresse att undersöka huruvida elever även använder sig av inkongruenta interrogativer som en del av sociala praktiker då de gör andraspråkslärande med varandra.

I studien analyseras sex situationer med fokus på vilka handlingar inkongruenta interrogativer verkar projicera och vilka handlingar som deltagarna uppfattar att frågan producerar i social interaktion då deltagarna orienterar sig emot andraspråkslärande. Resultaten visar att elever använder inkongruenta interrogativer på liknande sätt som lärare då de stöder och hjälper elever i deras lärande (Kasper, 2004; Mehan, 1979; Mori, 2004; Tanner, 2014; Drew, 2012; Margutti, 2010; Markee, 2004). Elever verkar använda sig av inkongruenta interrogativer för att initiera andraspråkslärande som social handling och göra rollerna som ”andraspråkslärare” och ”andraspråksinlärare” interaktionellt relevanta. Frågan verkar vara en social praktik genom vilken deltagarna initierar instruktionssekvenser i andraspråkslärande och den verkar göra ur både frågeställarens och svararens perspektiv två huvudsakliga handlingar relevanta: talaren (1) initierar en instruktionssekvens och (2) genom den handlingen föreslås ömsesidiga, epistemiskt asymmetriska, roller som ”andraspråkslärare” och ”andraspråksinlärare”. Meddeltagaren (svararen) kan (1) rikta sig mot den projicerade sekvensen genom att försöka svara på frågan eller genom att uttrycka svag ovetande epistemisk hållning eller (2) motstå den föreslagna sekvensen genom att uttrycka starkt ovetande epistemisk hållning och inte öppna för fortsatta instruktioner.

En aspekt som verkar viktig för att en sekvensstruktur som beskrivits ovan ska kunna göras är att lärandeobjektet måste tydligt vara i frågeställarens ”epistemiska ägo”. Med andra ord ska det vara så gott som etablerat vem som vet mera i fråga om lärandeobjektet. Även om denna aspekt kan anses vara så gott som etablerad, måste ändå deltagare aktivt förhålla sig till den för att den ska vara situationellt relevant. Genom inkongruenta interrogativer föreslås denna aspekt bli relevant och genom det även rollerna som mer/mindre vetande och andraspråkslärare och -inlärare. Med andra ord verkar deltagares epistemiska status och hur frågan är lingvistiskt formad (interrogativer) påverka hur frågan uppfattas och vilken handling eller vilka handlingar den uppfattas göra (se Heritage, 2013). Med ett perspektiv på

andraspråkslärande som social handling verkar inkongruenta interrogativer vara specifikt formade för och använda av deltagare för att initiera specifika sociala praktiker i anknytning till att göra andraspråkslärande.

## Diskussion

Avhandlingens huvudsakliga bidrag till forskningen om andraspråkslärande i social interaktion är att samtalsanalysens analytiska verktyg och förståelse av interaktionens kontext samt struktur kan bidra med nya insikter i och om andraspråkslärande som en vardaglig del av människors interaktion. Med en bättre förståelse av kedjan i datakonstruktionen och genom att i analysen tillämpa det epistemiska ramverket för analys (epistemisk status, hållning, kongruens osv.) kan forskare (och deltagarna) bättre förstå de vardagliga kunskapsförhandlingarna och analysera hur deltagarna orienterar sig emot lärandeobjekt och gör andraspråkslärande.

Analysen och förståelsen av lärande i interaktion påverkas starkt av datakonstruktionen och vice versa. Videostudiens design påverkar valet av analytiskt fokus, som i sin tur påverkar vilka aspekter av lärande i interaktion som studeras eller kan studeras samt hurdana resultat studien kommer fram till. Beroende på vilken/vilka aspekter man fokuserar i datakonstruktionen och vilka val man gör påverkar det starkt den efterföljande analytiska betoningen och gör den delvis förutsägbar. Det finns med andra ord inte "ett recept" för hur man kan/ska designa datakonstruktionen för att studera lärande i interaktion. Själva fenomenet, lärande i interaktion, är för mångfacetterat och föränderligt i den sociala interaktionen för att man ska kunna fånga lärande på samma sätt varje gång i olika kontexter och miljöer. Men det är av vikt att förstå premisserna före man går ut på fältet för att "samla" sitt data eller rättare sagt "konstruera" det. Videoinspelning är att aktivt skapa och konstruera data. Det är aldrig fullständigt objektivt och det fångar aldrig en situation fullständigt. Varje val att zooma in eller ut, att ställa sig i hörnet, att använda en trådlös mikrofon och så vidare är en del av skapandet av data. I datakonstruktionen behöver man ta i beaktande vilket intresse av lärande man har och vilket perspektiv på lärande i interaktion man har.

Det är en väsentlig skillnad i hurdant lärande man kan analysera och fånga på film beroende på om man filmar i helklass, följer en fokusdeltagare i och genom dennes skolvardag eller väljer ut enbart tillfällen, kontexter och miljöer där deltagare troligen gör lärande om en form av aktivitet eller ett visst ämne. Andra väsentliga skillnader är om man använder en eller flera kameror, hur longitudinellt data är och försöker finna kopplingar mellan olika situationer och helheter eller är enbart intresserad av mikrosekventiell analys. Studier som på ytan verkar lika kan i slutändan använda vitt skilda former av datakonstruktion vilket skiljer dem åt. Termerna "reliabel" och "valid" är vanliga i kvantitativa studier, men alltför sällan uppmärksammade i kvalitativa studier som, till exempel, videostudier. En orsak är att det i videostudier (eller kvalitativa studier i allmänhet) är svårt att fastställa

reliabilitet och validitet, men det betyder inte att man ändå kan sträva efter dem. Det finns dock ingen enskild metod för hur man ska göra, men genom att visa en medvetenhet och reflexivitet om de val som gjorts i datakonstruktionen och hur de påverkat hela kedjan ända till resultaten kan man till en del argumentera för reliabilitet och validitet. Med andra ord: för att studien ska kunna uppfattas som reliabel och valid är det viktigt att uppmärksamma datakonstruktionen; relationen mellan hur data har spelats in och hur det påverkar analysen.

Det lärande som studeras och diskuteras i denna avhandling är av en mikrosekventiell karaktär. Det betyder att longitudinella anspråk på lärande eller utveckling över en längre tid inte görs. Fokus är på mikrosekventiella sociala praktiker som deltagare använder för att producera sociala handlingar som uppfattas som andraspråkslärande. Med andra ord är de empiriska studierna i avhandlingen främst av en innehållsfokuserad karaktär (se Rusk et al., 2014). En del av dessa sociala praktiker innebär deltagares hantering av sina och andras relativa kunskaper i andraspråket och om lärandeobjektet. Denna kunskapshantering är synnerligen viktig i situationer då man förlitar sig på att uppehålla och reparera intersubjektivitet genom att använda en deltagares andraspråk (Rusk et al., 2016). Miljöer där detta kan ske är klassrum i vilka man tillämpar någon form av kommunikativ andraspråksundervisning, till exempel ämnesintegrerad språkundervisning. Dessa miljöer verkar vara och bli komplexa med tanke på kunskapshantering i och med användningen av andraspråket som även är del av lärandeobjektet. Det verkar skapa viss epistemisk diskrepans (vitt skilda förståelser av och olika kunskap om andraspråket och/eller användningen av andraspråket) som kan leda till utdragna missförstånd och problem i den gemensamma förståelsen. Dessa situationer kan även leda till att deltagare gör aktiviteten eller uppgiften utan att ena parten kan eller vet vad den handlar om. Med andra ord kan aktiviteten eller uppgiften rama in deltagares handlingar så de lämnar eventuellt lärande av mer konceptuell och abstrakt kunskap om lexikala objekt. En annan orsak till att de orienterar sig enbart emot att göra uppgiften, utan att uppnå en djupare kunskap om orden är att lärande om dessa kan bli för svårt i och genom andraspråket. En mer dynamisk användning av båda språken som är gemensamma för deltagarna, med andra ord att även använda förstaspråket, kunde då vara till gagn för att göra andraspråkslärande.

I och genom kunskapshantering kan deltagare också ställa frågor som de redan vet svaret till och bjuda in till att göra andraspråkslärande i samförstånd. Inkongruenta interrogativ verkar vara en del av de sociala praktiker som deltagare kan använda sig av då de gör andraspråkslärande som social handling (Rusk et al., accepted). Genom inkongruenta interrogativ verkar deltagare (talare) göra två handlingar: (1) initiera en instruktionssekvens och (2) i och genom den handlingen föreslå ömsesidiga epistemiskt asymmetriska K+ och K- status då deltagarna gör rollerna ”lärare” och ”elev”



interaktionellt relevanta. Den mottagande parten kan då ta ställning till detta genom att antingen (1) likrikta sina handlingar med den projicerade instruktionssekvensen eller (2) stå emot. Med andra ord är inte inkongruenta interrogativ enbart icke-kommunikativa och oönskade i andraspråklärande, utan de kan även användas för att bjuda in till instruktionssekvenser och göra andraspråklärande genom att klart föreslå ett lärandeobjekt och epistemiskt asymmetriska roller. På så vis är deltagares epistemiska status och den lingvistiska designen av turer en stor del av hur handlingar med lärandeorientering uppfattas.

Studierna i denna avhandling framlägger en sekventiell beskrivning av en social organisation av handlingar, som verkar initieras av en social praktik som här kallas inkongruenta interrogativer, som deltagare använder sig av då de gör andraspråklärande. I och genom detta bidrar studierna även till en bättre förståelse av deltagares kunskapshandling gällande både andraspråklärande och upprätthållandet av intersubjektivitet. Med andra ord verkar dessa vara samverkande sociala praktiker. Deltagare gör andraspråklärande genom att orientera sig emot lärandeobjekt och en förändring i kunskapen/förståelsen av dem samtidigt som de uppnår och upprätthåller en gemensam förståelse om deras gemensamma sociala aktiviteter i och genom att hantera egna och andras kunskaper gällande relevanta lärandeobjekt och kunskapsdomäner. Detta bidrag börjar med en förståelse av hurdant lärande det är man studerar samt hur det kan/ska fångas på film för senare analys (Study 1). Avhandlingen är starkt innehållsfokuserad till sin karaktär och genom den formen av datakonstruktion kan avhandlingen bättre ringa in och analysera hur deltagare hanterar egna och andras uppvisade och förväntade språkkunskaper i situationer då de orienterar sig emot lärande och lärandeobjekt i andraspråket (Study 2). Genom att bygga vidare på denna förståelse av deltagares kunskapshandling i situationer då de orienterar sig emot andraspråklärande kan avhandlingen ”upptäcka” en återkommande social praktik (inkongruenta interrogativer) som verkar vara en del av de handlingssekvenser då deltagare gör andraspråklärande (Study 3). Denna avhandlings tre studier bidrar som en helhet till att vidareutveckla analysen och forskningen i och om andraspråklärande som social handling.

Denna avhandlings bidrag till lärandevetenskap är att fortsätta bana väg för att empiriskt analysera och uppfatta lärande som ett observerbart socialt fenomen; social(a) handling(ar) som deltagare aktivt förhåller sig till och gör eller inte gör. Lärande är inte något som ”bara sker” eller ”händer i personers mentala värld/sinne” medan de aktivt gör något helt annat; deltagare kan aktivt välja att göra lärande och orientera emot att göra lärande i samförstånd med varann.

## References

- Aarsand, P., & Forsberg, L. (2010). Producing children's corporeal privacy: ethnographic video recording as material-discursive practice. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 249–268.
- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151–167.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314–342.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Behan, L., Turnbull, M., & Spek, J. (1997). The proficiency gap in late French immersion: Language use in collaborative tasks. *Le Journal de l'Immersion*, 20(2), 41–44.
- Billig, M. (1999a). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 572–576.
- Billig, M. (1999b). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 543–558.
- Björk-Willén, P. (2006). *Lära och leka med flera språk*. Linköping university, Linköping, Sweden.
- Brammerts, H. (2003). Språkinläring i tandem och inlärautonomi. Om utvecklingen av ett koncept. In B. Jonsson (Ed.), *Självstyrd språkinläring i tandem. En handbok* (pp. 13–22). Härnösand: Department of Humanities, Mid Sweden University.
- Brammerts, H., & Kleppin, K. (2003). Hjälp för lärande i tandem. Exempel från tandemservernarna. In B. Jonsson (Ed.), *Självstyrd språkinläring i tandem. En handbok* (pp. 97–120). Härnösand: Department of Humanities, Mid Sweden University.
- Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262–274.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 29–47.
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1439–1465.
- Bushnell, C. (2015). Lost in translation? On using conversation analysis to examine cross-linguistic data. *Area Studies Tsukuba*, 36, 107–126.
- Cekaite, A. (2006). *Getting started. Children's participation and language learning in an L2 classroom*. Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.
- Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 45–62.
- Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2004). Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: Playful recyclings in an immersion classroom. *Discourse Studies*, 6(3), 373–392.
- Cekaite, A., & Ewaldsson, A.-C. (2008). Staging linguistic identities and negotiating monolingual norms in multiethnic school settings. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 177–196.
- Clift, R. (2012). Who knew? A view from linguistics. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 69–75.
- Csibra, G., & Gergely, G. (2009). Natural pedagogy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(4), 148–153.
- Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., Hall, R., Koschmann, T., Lemke, J. L., Sherin, M. G., & Sherin, B. L. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(1), 3–53.
- Drew, P. (1981). Adults' corrections of children's mistakes: A response to Wells and Montgomery. In P. French & M. MacLure (Eds.), *Adult-Child Conversation: Studies in structure and process* (pp. 244–267). London: Croom Helm.
- Drew, P. (1995). Conversation analysis. In J. Smith, R. Harre, L. van Langenhove, & P. Stearns (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 64–79). London: Sage.
- Drew, P. (2012). What drives sequences? *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 61–68.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (2006). Editor's introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Conversation analysis volume 1: Turn-taking and repair* (pp. XXI–XXXVII). London: Sage Publications.
- Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1988). Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems*, 35, 398–417.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139–

- 182).
- Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: The development of joint understanding in the classroom*. London: Methuen.
- Ekström, A. (2012). *Instructional work in textile craft : Studies of interaction, embodiment and the making of objects*. Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Theoretical pluralism in SLA: Is there a way forward? In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 23–51). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Emanuelsson, J., & Sahlström, F. (2008). The price of participation: Teacher control versus student participation in classroom interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 52(2), 205–223.
- Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (Eds.). (2006). *Roots of human Sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Finnish National Board of Education. (2004). *Core curriculum for basic education 2004*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education.
- Finnish National Board of Education. (2013). *Elevernas språkbakgrund i årskurs 1–6 i de svensk-språkiga skolorna år 2013*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education. Retrieved 3.2.2016: [http://www.opf.fi/download/164942\\_sprakbakgrund2\\_slutlig\\_ensidig.pdf](http://www.opf.fi/download/164942_sprakbakgrund2_slutlig_ensidig.pdf)
- Firth, A. (1998). SLA property: No trespassing! *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(1), 91–94.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(Focus Issue), 800–819.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gardner, R. (2007). 'Broken' starts: Bricolage in turn starts in second language talk. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (pp. 58–71). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gardner, R. (2012). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593–611). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be a response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(1), 83–90.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224–255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gergely, G., & Csibra, G. (2006). Sylvia's recipe: The role of imitation and pedagogy in the transmission of cultural knowledge. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 229–255). Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Gergely, G., & Csibra, G. (2013). Natural pedagogy. In M.R. Banaji & S.A. Gelman (Eds.), *Navigating the social world: What infants, children, and other species can teach us* (pp. 127–132). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gergely, G., Egyed, K., & Király, I. (2007). On pedagogy. *Developmental Science*, 10(1), 139–146.
- Gibbons, P. (1998). Classroom talk and the learning of new registers in a second language. *Language and Education*, 12(2), 99–118.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order: American Sociological Association, 1982 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 1–17.
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text*, 6(3), 283–316.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2006). Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 97–125). Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8–23.
- Gordon, C. (2012). Beyond the observer's paradox: the audio-recorder as a resource for the display of identity. *Qualitative Research*, 13(3), 299–317.
- Hägglom, J., Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (2003). En kort beskrivning av fältarbetet i FISK-projektet. In H. Pérez Prieto & F. Sahlström (Eds.) *Från förskola till skola – berättelser från ett forskningsprojekt* (pp. 192–208). Uppsala: Pedagogisk Forskning i Uppsala 149.
- Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 607–612.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 511–526.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 interactional competence and*

- development*. Bristol Buffalo Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Hargreaves, E. (2012). Teachers' classroom feedback: Still trying to get it right. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 7, 1–15.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: a book of readings* (pp. 401–435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hauser, E. (2009). Turn-taking and primary speakership during a student discussion. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 215–244). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Hayano, K. (2012). Question design in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 395–414). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 568–582.
- Heikkilä, M., & Sahlström, F. (2003). Om användning av videospelning i fältarbete. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 8(1–2), 24–41.
- Heinemann, T., Steensig, J., & Lindström, A. (2011). Addressing epistemic incongruence in question-answer sequences through the use of epistemic adverbs. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation* (pp. 107–130). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113–132.
- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2012). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984b). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice* (pp. 161–182). London: Sage.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional Talk. In R. Sanders & K. Fitch (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103–146). Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.
- Heritage, J. (2011). Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: Empathic moments in interaction. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation* (pp. 159–183). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370–394). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). Beyond and behind the words: Some reactions to my commentators. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 76–81.
- Heritage, J. (2012c). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1–29.
- Heritage, J. (2012d). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 30–52.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 551–578.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15–38.
- Holm, G., & Londen, M. (2010). The discourse on multicultural education in Finland: education for whom. *Intercultural Education*, 21(2), 107–120.
- Hummelstedt, I., Sahlström, F., Forsman, L., Pörn, M., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2008). *Datainsamling och inledande datahantering, FLIS-projektet våren 2008. FLIS-rapport 1:2008*. Retrieved, 28.1.2016: [http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv\\_flis](http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv_flis)
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ivarsson, P.-M. (2003). *Barns gemenskap i förskolan*. Uppsala university, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Jaffe, A. M. (2009). Stance in a Corsican school: Institutional and ideological orders. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 119–145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakonen, T. (2014a). *Knowing matters: How students address lack of knowledge in bilingual classroom interaction*. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Jakonen, T. (2014b). Building bridges: How secondary school pupils bring their informal learning experiences into a Content and Language Integrated (CLIL) classroom. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 8(1), 7–28.
- Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied linguistics*, 36(1), 73–94.

- Jefferson, G. (1981). 'Caveat speaker': A preliminary exploration of shift implicative reciprocity in the articulation of topic. Final report to the (British) Social Science Research Council. Retrieved, 28.1.2016: [http://www.liso.ucsb.edu/liso\\_archives/Jefferson/](http://www.liso.ucsb.edu/liso_archives/Jefferson/)
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 4, 39–103.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: a multiseimiotic perspective*. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 86–105.
- Karjalainen, K. (2011). *Interaktion som mål och medel i FinTandem - Strategier och orientering vid problem i språkproduktion*. Vaasan yliopisto, Vaasa.
- Karjalainen, K., Pörn, M., Rusk, F., & Björkskog, L. (2013). Classroom tandem – Outlining a model for language learning and instruction. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1), 165–184.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2006). Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk*, 26(6), 699–731.
- Karlsson, S. (2006). *Positioneringsfraser i interaktion*. University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 551–567.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 11–36.
- Kern, R. G. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 441–461.
- Kitzinger, C. (2012). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229–256). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 43(2), 183–209.
- Koole, T. (2012). The epistemics of student problems: Explaining mathematics in a multilingual class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(13), 1902–1916.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(3), 277–309.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory and applications*. Laredo.
- Lafford, B. A. (2007). Second language acquisition reconceptualized? *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(Focus Issue), 735–756.
- Lave, J. (1993). The practice of learning. In S. Chaiklin & J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding practice: perspectives on activity and context* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y.-A. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text & Talk*, 30(4), 403–422.
- Lee, Y.-A. & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 48(4), 763–788.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lilja, N. (2010). *Ongelmista oppimiseen*. Jyväskylä University, Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98–116.
- Lindström, J. (2008). *Tur och ordning. Introduktion till svensk samtalsgrammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.
- Lindwall, O. (2008). *Lab work in science education: Instruction, inscription, and the practical achievement of understanding*. Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.
- Lindwall, O., & Ekström, A. (2012). Instruction-in-interaction: The teaching and learning of a manual skill. *Human Studies*, 35(1), 27–49.
- Lindwall, O., & Lymer, G. (2011). Uses of 'understand' in science education. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 452–474.
- Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Lojander-Visapää, C. (2001). *Med rätt att välja. Språkval och språkstrategier i språkligt blandade hushåll i Helsingfors*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Lomax, H., & Casey, N. (1998). Recording social life: reflexivity and video methodology. *Sociological Research Online*, 3(2).

- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bahtia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268–285). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Lymer, G. (2010). *The work of critique in architectural education*. University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Multilingual Matters.
- Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's learning lessons reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 239–280.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33, 703–736.
- Majlesi, A. R. (2015). Matching gestures – Teachers' repetitions of students' gestures in second language learning classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 30–45.
- Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(3–4), 193–207.
- Mansikka, J.-E., & Holm, G. (2011). Teaching minority students within minority schools: teachers' conceptions of multicultural education in Swedish-speaking schools in Finland. *Intercultural Education*, 22(2), 133–144.
- Margutti, P. (2006). 'Are you human beings?' Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 17, 313–346.
- Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 43, 315–345.
- Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 63–92.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 583–596.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(iv), 491–500.
- Maynard, D. W. (2012). Everyone and no one to turn to: Intellectual roots and contexts for conversation analysis. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 11–31). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Maynard, D. W., & Weathersbee, T. (2007). Ethnomethodology. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. (pp. 1483–1486). Blackwell Publishing.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in society*, 7, 183–213.
- McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, 19, 349–377.
- McMillan, B., & Turnbull, M. (2010). Teachers' use of the first language in french immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.
- Melander, H. (2009). *Trajectories of learning*. Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Melander, H. (2012a). Knowing how to play the game of jump rope: Participation and stancetaking in a material environment. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 1434–1456.
- Melander, H. (2012b). Transformations of knowledge within a peer group. Knowing and learning in interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(3–4), 232–248.
- Melander, H., & Sahlström, F. (2009). In tow of the blue whale: Learning as interactional changes in topical orientation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(8), 1519–1537.
- Melander, H., & Sahlström, F. (2010). *Lärande i interaktion*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Monahan, T., & Fisher, J. A. (2010). Benefits of "observer effects": lessons from the field. *Qualitative Research*, 10(3), 357–376.
- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 117–129.
- Mondada, L. (2011a). The management of knowledge discrepancies and of epistemic changes in institutional interactions. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 27–57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mondada, L. (2011b). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 542–552.

- Mondada, L. (2012a). Video analysis and the temporality of inscriptions within social interaction: the case of architects at work. *Qualitative Research*, 12(3), 304–333.
- Mondada, L. (2012b). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 32–56). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 501–518.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 536–550.
- Mori, J. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied linguistics*, 27(2), 195–219.
- Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(Focus Issue), 849–862.
- Musk, N. (2014). Avoiding the target language with the help of google: Managing language choices in gathering information for EFL project work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(1), 110–135.
- Musk, N., & Cekaite, A. (forthcoming). Mobilising distributed memory resources in English project work. In R. Säljö (Ed.), *Memory practices and learning – interactional, institutional and sociocultural perspectives*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416–434.
- Niemelä, N. (2008). *Interaktion i helklass under ett tema i språkbad*. University of Vaasa, Vaasa, Finland.
- Official Statistics of Finland (OSF): Population structure. (2008). The largest groups by native language 1998 and 2008. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Retrieved, 19.1.2016: [http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2008/vaerak\\_2008\\_2009-03-27\\_kuv\\_005\\_en.html](http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2008/vaerak_2008_2009-03-27_kuv_005_en.html)
- Pallotti, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social Practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 1–16). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Tainio, L. (2009a). Collaborative game-play as a site for participation and situated learning of a second language. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 167–183.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Tainio, L. (2009b). Other-repetition as a resource for participation in the activity of playing a video game. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(ii), 153–169.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Tainio, L. (2014). Asymmetries of knowledge and epistemic change in social gaming interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(4), 1022–1038.
- Pollner, M. (1974). Mundane reasoning. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 4, 35–54.
- Pollner, M. (1975). “The very coinage of your brain”: The anatomy of reality disjunctures. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 5, 411–430.
- Pörn, M., & Norrman, H. (2011). *Sano se suomeksi - Säg det på finska* (Publikation Nr 22). Vasa: Pedagogiska fakulteten vid Åbo Akademi i Vasa.
- Pörn, M., & Törni, J. (2010). *KUKAKO*. Vasa: Pedagogiska fakulteten vid Åbo Akademi.
- Potter, J. (2012). Re-reading discourse and social psychology: Transforming social psychology. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(3), 436–455.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Radford, J., Blatchford, P., & Webster, R. (2011). Opening up and closing down: How teachers and TAs manage turn-taking, topic and repair in mathematics lessons. *Language and Instruction*, 21, 625–635.
- Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in society*, 35(05), 677–705.
- Rusk, F., & Pörn, M. (2013). Epistemisk positionering som en del av andraspråkslärande i social interaktion. In M. Eronen & M. Rodi-Risberg (Eds.), *Point of view as challenge. VAKKI-symposiumi XXXIII 7.-8.2.2013* (pp. 315–326). Vasa: VAKKI Publications 2.
- Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016). The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in

- second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 184–205.
- Rusk, F., Pörn, M., Sahlström, F., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2014). Perspectives on using video recordings in conversation analytical studies on learning in interaction. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 38(1), 39–55.
- Rusk, F., Sahlström, F., & Pörn, M. (accepted). Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: Incongruent interrogative-practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation (I & II)*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Sahlström, F. (2009). Conversation analysis as a way of studying learning—An introduction to a special issue of SJER. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 103–111.
- Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as social action. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 43–62). Bristol Buffalo Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Sahlström, F., Forsman, L., Hummelstedt-Djedou, I., Pörn, M., Rusk, F., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2013). *Språk och identitet i undervisning - inga konstigheter*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Sahlström, F., Pörn, M., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2008). "Mitä tarkoittaa speaking English?" Flerspråkiga barns lärande och identitet i och utanför skolan. *Svenskan i Finland*, 10, 293–309.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine, & S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150–171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American journal of sociology*, 1295–1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 161–216.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse and Society*, 10, 577–582.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied linguistics*, 21(2), 205–243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: "Mobilizing response". *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 43(1), 38–48.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 3–31.
- Schütz, A. (1962). *Collected papers, volume 1: The problem of social reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Schütz, A. (1964). The well-informed citizen: An essay on the social distribution of knowledge. In A. Brodersen (Ed.), *Alfred Schütz collected papers volume 2: Studies in social theory* (pp. 120–135). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Pub.
- Seedhouse, P. (2007). On ethnomethodological CA and "linguistic CA": A reply to Hall. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 527–533.
- Seedhouse, P., & Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 127–146). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seedhouse, P., Walsh, S., & Jenks, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sert, O. (2013). 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1), 13–28.
- Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77, 97–112.
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27, 4–13.
- Sfard, A. (2008). *Thinking as communicating. Human development, the growth of discourses, and mathematizing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2005). *Talk and practical epistemology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.



- Sidnell, J. (2012a). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77–99). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. (2012b). Declaratives, questioning, defeasibility. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 53–60.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sjöholm, K., & Björklund, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Content and language integrated learning. Teachers' and teacher educators' experiences of English medium teaching*. Vaasa: Åbo Akademi.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2005). *Ja vet int va de heter på svenska*. Åbo Akademi University, Vaasa, Finland.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., & Forsman, L. (2013). *Skolspråk och lärande*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2012). Learning how to be a tähti: A case study of language development in everyday situations of a 7-year-old multilingual Finnish child. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17, 153–173.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., & Rusk, F. (2010). Händelser i tv-soffan. Samtal, språk och program utgående från några flerspråkiga 6–8-åriga barns tv-tittande. In A. Slotte-Lüttge (Ed.), *Plastkassar och andra texter. Perspektiv på det vidgade textbegreppet* (pp. 101–114). Vasa: Åbo Akademi, Pedagogiska fakulteten.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., Rusk, F., & Sahlström, F. (2010). *Corrections, categorization and code switching – a case study of the consequences of Finnish Swedish-medium classes moving into a Finnish-medium school*. Paper presented at the EARLI Sig 10 and 21 meeting, July 7, 2010. Retrieved, 29.1.2016: [http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv\\_flis](http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv_flis)
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., Sahlström, F., Hummelstedt, I., Rusk, F., & Grönberg, L. (2010). *Ökad språklig medvetenhet, både mer och mindre finska*. Internet version published 27.9.2010: [http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv\\_flis](http://www.abo.fi/fakultet/fpv_flis)
- Stivers, T., Mondada, L., & Steensig, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2012). Introduction. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 1–8). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 253–276.
- Tandefelt, M., & Finnäs, F. (2007). Language and demography: Historical development. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187/188, 35–54.
- Tanner, M. (2014). *Lärarens väg genom klassrummet*. Karlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden.
- Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 161–178.
- ten Have, P. (2006). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Thoms, J., Liao, J., & Szustak, A. (2005). The use of L1 in an L2 on-line chat activity. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 62(1), 161–182.
- Toropainen, O. (2010). *Utvärdering av läroämnet niska i den grundläggande utbildningen*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.
- Tuokko, E. (2009). *Miten ruotsia osataan peruskouluissa? Perusopetuksen päättövaiheen ruotsin kielen B- oppimäärän oppimistulosten kansallinen arviointi 2008*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.
- Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.). (2010). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302–325.
- Wagner, J. (2010). Learning and doing learning in interaction: What do participants do in everyday out-of-school second language talk? In Y. Kite & K. Ikeda (Eds.), *Language learning and socialization through conversations* (pp. 51–59). Osaka: Kansai University, Center for Human Activity Theory.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247–266.
- Waring, H. Z. (2012). Yes–no questions that convey a critical stance in the language classroom. *Language and Education*, 26(5), 451–469.
- Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied linguistics*, 21(1), 244–267.
- Wootton, A. J. (1989). Remarks on the methodology of conversation analysis. In P. Bull & D. Roger (Eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 238–258). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wootton, A. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 519–535.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1. Transcript symbols

Transcription conventions adapted from Jefferson (2004) and Hepburn and Bolden (2012).

(.)	a micropause less than 0.2 seconds
(0.5)	a silence indicated in tenths of seconds
[text]	overlapping talk or co-occurring embodied actions
<u>text</u>	stress or emphasis
TEXT	louder talk than normal
°text°	markedly quiet talk
:	prolongation/stretching of the prior sound
>text<	faster talk than normal
<text>	slower talk than normal
text-	cut-off or self-interrupted talk
((text))	non-verbal/embodied activity
(text)	likely hearing of talk
(Si) / X	the identity of speaker is not clear
( )	inaudible
=	talk/embodied activity latches on previous turn
@text@	animated voice
#text#	creaky voice
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
hh (hh)	hearable exhale
.hh (.hh)	hearable inhale
text	English translation of Finnish
<b>text</b>	English translation of Swedish

Fredrik Rusk

# Doing Second Language Learning

A CA Study of Learning Practices in  
Finnish-Swedish Bilingual Educational  
Settings

Learning, including second language learning, is considered to be an integral part of everyday activities of humans. This project is a humble attempt at understanding these everyday activities in-and-through considering second language learning as immensely everyday social actions that are done by individuals as they interact with each other. The study relies on a conversation analytical perspective on learning as nothing exceptional, extraordinary, or elusive happening in the minds of humans. Instead, learning is understood as oddly familiar, mundane, and unpretentiously observable in human social interaction.

This thesis contributes to the development of conversation analytical methods for the empirical analysis of second language learning as an observable interactive phenomenon and highlights the role of epistemics in the actions through which second language learning is done and oriented to.



9 789521 234392 >

ISBN 978-952-12-3439-2