Student Interaction during Group Work in a Multilingual University Setting. Suggestions, Epistemic Orientations and Scaffolding Behaviors

Mandy Lee Deal

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Departament de Didàctica de la Llengua i la Literatura, i de Ciències Socials

Doctorat en Didàctica de la Llengua i la Literatura

Tesi Doctoral

Student Interaction during Group Work in a Multilingual University Setting

Suggestions, Epistemic Orientations and Scaffolding Behaviors

Doctoranda: Sra. Mandy Lee Deal

Directora: Dra. Emilee Moore

Tutora: Dra. Melinda Dooly

Bellaterra, setembre de 2016

Abstract

This thesis consists in a conversation analysis (CA) of interaction among university students engaging in group work outside of the classroom, without the physical presence of a teacher, as part of a subject taught by the author. The task involves preparing for an oral presentation in students' third language, English. The students' interaction is mediated by presentation slides, among other artifacts. A priori, the students occupy institutionally and epistemically equal statuses as regards normative expectations within this context. The analysis explores how they coordinate their actions and engage in different layers of activity to accomplish the task. It further examines the learning opportunities that such a context may afford.

The findings indicate that the previously prepared presentation slides maintained an order, which guided the overall and ongoing structure of the students' meeting activity. However, it was especially suggestion sequences that mobilized participants' collaborative actions towards co-constructing the presentation. The phenomena that shaped and constrained the students' interaction were seen in their orientations towards each other's epistemic status, and the associated entitlement and responsibilities thereof. Furthermore, learning opportunities emerging in the form of scaffolding behavior were observed to recur throughout the courses of the unfolding interactions.

Research in this area is relevant as collaborative work among peers in the educational setting is a ubiquitous practice that is carried out inside and outside of the classroom. While the greater part of research has been dedicated to studying such activity in classrooms where a teacher is present, less has analyzed interaction among peers in an extra-classroom, yet institutional setting. This study contributes to the growing field of conversation analysis research in multilingual, higher education learning contexts. From the perspective of practitioner research, it has also contributed to the implementation of certain methodological changes to the pedagogical activity studied.

Resumen

Esta tesis, enfocada des del análisis de la conversación, examina la interacción entre estudiantes universitarios que, como parte de una asignatura impartida por la autora, participan en un trabajo grupal fuera del aula y sin la presencia de la profesora. La tarea consiste en preparar una presentación oral en la tercera lengua, en este caso el inglés. La interacción de los estudiantes es mediada por las diapositivas de su presentación, entre otros artefactos. A priori, estos estudiantes tienen un estatus equitativo tanto institucional como epistemológicamente con respecto a les expectativas normativas en este contexto. El análisis explora como éstos estudiantes coordinan sus acciones y participan en diferentes capas de actividad para llevar a cabo la tarea. Así mismo, se examinan las oportunidades de aprendizaje que un contexto de este tipo puede llegar a suponer.

Los resultados obtenidos muestran como las diapositivas, previamente preparadas por los alumnos, mantienen un orden el cual actúa como guía de la estructura general de la actividad de los estudiantes. Sin embargo, las secuencias de sugerencias movilizaron las acciones más colaborativas de estos participantes y les permitieron, finalmente, co-crear la presentación. Los fenómenos que dieron forma y a la vez limitaron la interacción de los estudiantes surgieron de las orientaciones hacia los estatus epistémicos de cada uno, así como en los derechos y las responsabilidades asociadas a los mismos. Además, a medida que se desarrollaban estas interacciones se observaron comportamientos de andamiaje que se convertirían en oportunidades de aprendizaje.

Este área de investigación es actualmente relevante ya que el trabajo cooperativo entre compañeros es una práctica habitual en el ámbito educativo, tanto en el aula como fuera de ella. Mientras la mayor parte de investigaciones se ha dedicado a estudiar dicha práctica dentro el aula con la presencia del profesor, una minoría analiza interacciones entre alumnos fuera de ella, pero aún en un entorno institucional. De esta manera, el presente estudio contribuye al creciente campo de investigación inspirada en el análisis de la conversación en entornos multilingües de educación superior. Desde el punto de vista de la investigación aplicada en el propio aula de la autora como profesora, este estudio también ha contribuido a realizar ciertos cambios metodológicos en su actividad pedagógica.

Acknowledgements

This project has added another dimension to my understanding and experience of thankfulness. It has drawn back the curtain to reveal the true meaning of collaboration and the multitude of participants that have contributed in the arduous, but inspiring process that this doctoral challenge involved. Reflecting on the diversity in the types of support of which I have been the (very grateful) beneficiary, leads me to a humbling and transformative place. I will start this long list of thanks giving with those who have been with me the longest on this path.

I dedicate this thesis to my parents, who fomented in me self-confidence and self-love. I thank my father, Dr. Tom Deal, who encouraged questioning and thinking out loud with others. Though both of my parents encouraged my educational goals, it was my mother, Nancy Deal, who went back to study Education when I was an adolescent. I therefore had a strong role model of a mother returning to higher education. I am grateful for this memory, and I hope that I can be such a role modal to my own children.

I thank my sister, Melanie Deal, who through her constant email messages and telephone calls raised my spirit and confidence levels in those many moments of self-doubt. The message she wrote in the beginning years of my thesis has been my *mantra,* which helped me remember that my past experience could be a valuable tool in this process: "Mandy you have been working on this doctorate for thirty years."

I cannot have done any of this without the daily support of my husband, Paddy Mannion, my daughter, Clare, and my son Tommy. On one hand they gave me the time and space (literally) that I needed to gather my thoughts and articulate and re-articulate them. At the same time, they pulled me out of my bubble often enough, so that I never lost contact with my real-life surroundings. I am grateful for Paddy's patience—we haven't gone out on a real date for a very long time—and his excellent, mind-healthy meals, even when it was my turn to cook for the 10th time.

I am very thankful for the input and encouragement I have received from my colleagues at work. I hope I can offer as much valuable support to them as they follow their own educational ambitions. Thanks, Joan Ploettner and Monica Clua for the long haul, and now Noelia Navarro, who helped with the translation of my thesis abstract. I owe so much to others in our department for pitching in to lighten my workload during these last several critical months. A huge thank you goes to Dr. Helena Roquet and Anna Navarro.

I also am very grateful for the role that others at the Universitat Internacional de Catalunya (UIC) have played in this process. Members of this institution not only provided the means for me to be able to do this by re-organizing my regular work-related responsibilities, but they also facilitated my research stay in Neuchâtel, Switzerland. I also thank Dr. Jaume Armengou for his counseling for my post-doctorate future with UIC. Many thanks to Dr. Lluís Giner, the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, who has shown nothing but kindness and enthusiasm in the

collaborative endeavors we have undertaken together for over 16 years. I am also very grateful for the students who participated in the study. They are the source of my inspiration to study interaction in this population in the future.

I will never be able to thank Dr. Emilee Moore enough for her supervision of this enterprise. Besides the invaluable work she has put into every stage of this (seemingly) never-ending project, she introduced me to aspects of academia that I did not even realize existed. She added so much more depth to this process. The experience was made better because of her professional expertise, as well as emotional support.

I also thank the GREIP Research community for their very positive contributions and opportunities to participate in research activities. I thank Dr. Melinda Dooly for agreeing to act as tutor, and for her support in this research process. I thank Dr. Luci Nussbaum not only for her omni-present encouragement—even though I did not see her very often—but also for her hand in making my research stay in Neuchâtel possible. This action alone raised my own feelings of self-confidence: if Dr. Nussbaum thought I could do it, then I believed I could, too.

A very special thanks goes to Dr. Simona Pekarek Doehler for hosting my research stay in Neuchâtel. I learned so much about research practices and culture from her and her research team during my stay there. The activities to which I was invited to participate there contributed to the development of my identity as a researcher. But even more than this, it was Dr. Pekarek Doehler who helped me see and understand scaffolding phenomena in my data.

Though somewhat on the periphery of this project, I also have a very special community of friends in Modesto, California to thank. They have all had a part in the millions of epiphanic moments and growth spurts that have led me to this project. In particular, I am grateful to the Modesto Church of the Brethren for the nearly forty years of spiritual support they have provided throughout so many milestones of my life. Their presence is felt as strongly as ever as this thesis project comes to an end.

Finally, some credit needs to be awarded to Coco, our family dog. She saved me many a time from losing my way in the confusing mazes of thoughts that I often conjured for myself throughout my writing processes. She did this by simply forcing me to take her on walks. These escapes into the mountains ultimately untangled my ideas that had become mired down after long periods of intense and elusive focus.

Index

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The current higher education context

A university context can constitute a complex educational environment for the many stakeholders involved, including but not limited to the students, teachers, curricula designers and policy makers. A variety of aspects associated with this educational setting make it a particularly challenging one for the student population, whose participation and learning experience there may represent a transformative process for them. Universities also present challenges for the teaching faculty who, like the author of this study, are fundamental to students' educational life.

The major part of responsibility for learning at the higher education (HE) level rests heavily on the students' shoulders while teachers must be skilled at creating spaces that foment autonomy while still guiding students in learning processes. Students are expected to have acquired a certain level of cognitive and social abilities to work autonomously, in a self-directed way (Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall, 2009; Fabregas, 2015). It is presumed that university students are more highly motivated than are their secondary school counterparts as higher education is not compulsory, unlike earlier formal educational levels. Furthermore, the choice of area to study is supposedly based on the students' own preferences or determination.

From a more practical perspective, learner autonomy is also essential because university faculty cannot often treat each individual student directly when working with large groups of students and classes and carrying out other responsibilities associated with university positions. Students must then learn to navigate through their educational experience with less assistance from a professor, or expert, than perhaps what other previous learning contexts may have entailed.

At the same time, current HE teaching methodology encourages students' working together in groups. Students are commonly required to participate with their peers in collaborative types of tasks and projects, ubiquitous activities encountered in many areas of the HE educational setting. Work carried out in groups may embody a greater degree of complexity, and in turn, demand more skill and effort than might work that individually achieved academic tasks entail. It has been this researcher's experience as a university teacher that one of the most

frequently reported complaints among students is related to obstacles in carrying out group work, due to unequal work load distribution or differing levels of commitment among group members.

Another dimension of the HE setting, especially in Europe over approximately the past two decades (see section 1.2), is related to goals towards multilingualism. HE has expanded its focus to include not only theoretical knowledge building and research but also professional training and employability-related objectives, specifically to meet social mobility and global economics needs (Holborow, 2012; 2015; Mercile & Murphy, 2015). Universities are expected to prepare students to interact competently in their future professional communities, which are no longer restricted by geographical borders. Consequently, more emphasis has been placed on learning and using languages as another skill, which will be relevant for a future career in a more globalized workforce, where multilingual resources have been deemed a commodity (Heller, 2003; but see Block, 2017 for a critical discussion regarding the use of this term).

These elements combine to render higher education a rich, but potentially daunting arena for general socialization as university students and future professionals and related learning processes. Accomplishing collaborative tasks in a multilingual educational setting forms a basic part of the current university experience for many students, who must draw from their interactional as well as their linguistic competences to successfully achieve shared goals. This is indeed a scenario that depicts the European and Catalan contexts within which the research described in this thesis is situated. The activity studied in this thesis takes place among students who are pursuing a Dentistry degree at a private university located near Barcelona. The collaborative task is part of course work in one of the degree subjects that treats orthodontics content taught in English, the students' third language (L3).

To facilitate a deeper understanding of such a labyrinthine enterprise, the next sections will explicate certain multilingual and collaborative facets of this social activity and situate them in the research context.

1.2 Multilingualism in the European Higher Education context

As a result of internationalization trends and the so-called Bologna process towards the creation of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA), there has been a motivating force to promote multilingualism in the European HE context. The action plan outlined by the Commission of the European Communities in 2003 (European Commission, 2003) set language goals at all levels of education. Educational endeavors, in this regard, have included student and staff exchange programs, and for those who do not participate in such initiatives, programs in

local institutions for encouraging "internationalization at home" (Nilsson, 1999; 2003; Crowther, 2001;), or internationalizing "the curricula and teaching and learning process" (de Wit, Decker & Hunter, 2015: 5) directed towards enhancing development of international and intercultural competence by students (Nilsson, 2003).

One of the language learning approaches that the Commission recommended to meet educational aims for multilingualism was the application of Content and Language Integrated Learning, or CLIL. Over the years, CLIL has been increasingly implemented in educational institutions throughout Europe (Eurydice, 2006). While this thesis is not primarily concerned with CLIL as a political initiative or pedagogical approach, a brief discussion is in order so as to contextualize the institutional dynamics within which the research was carried out.

The term Content Language and Integrated Learning was coined in the mid-1990s as an umbrella description for good bi/multilingual teaching and learning approaches and teaching methods that could be adopted in a wide variety of educational settings (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). CLIL is defined as: "A dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for learning and teaching of both content and language" (Coyle, et al., 2010: 1).

The rationale supporting the adoption of CLIL in educational settings is multifold. In practical terms and at the institutional level, the main justifications for CLIL are based on the premise that teaching certain subject matter in another language means increasing language learning time but not decreasing content class hours. In other words, CLIL enhances higher language competences at a faster rate and without dominating the curriculum with language classes (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). It also means that students can have higher exposure to the foreign language as well as to authentic subject-related materials and tasks in this language, all of which ultimately leads to more authentic interaction (Escobar, 2004). The genesis of CLIL can be traced in communicative and socio-cultural approaches to second language teaching (Coyle, Phillips & Marsh, 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2010; Vilkancienė, 2011).

In terms of content, the potential difficulties or the 'opacity' resulting from teaching in an additional language has been shown to provide novel opportunities for engaging with the 'density' of the subject matter, and hence for knowledge construction (Gajo, 2007; Moore, Borràs & Nussbaum, 2013). Furthermore, with such intensive learning of content in other languages, students are thought to become better prepared for future interaction in a multi-cultural and linguistically diverse global work force within specific professional functions (Marsh, 2002).

CLIL at the university level in Europe remains an emerging educational context,

which has evolved from the same EU guidelines and language policies. To differentiate the application of this approach in HE, some professionals agreed to use the term, ICLHE, or Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (Wilkinson & Zegers, 2007; Pérez-Vidal, 2015).

Unlike CLIL in primary and secondary schools, the student populations in ICLHE programs are considered as having already acquired certain academic and language skills; they are preparing to become active members of more globalized professional communities. ICLHE practices reflecting these needs have included theme-based language courses, Language for Specific/Academic Purposes, Content-Based courses, and Genre-Based courses taught by language specialists. These types of courses have a more pedagogical focus reflecting CLIL pedagogy in which learning objectives for both language and content are considered (Unterberger & Wilhelmer, 2011).

Universities have also opted to implement foreign or additional language medium instruction for content courses taught by content specialists, who tend to relegate language use to a vehicular role rather than an object of the course (Unterberger & Wilhelmer, 2011). The language that most university programs have chosen as the vehicle for such courses has been English, thus the term English Medium Instruction, or EMI, is also sometimes used (Academic Cooperation Association, 2008; Wilkinson & Zegers, 2008). Smit and Dafouz (2012) addressed the variability in the use of the terms CLIL, ICLHE and EMI and concluded: "the defining criteria for EMI and ICL depend strongly on the general research focus adopted" (2012: 4). In this study, ICLHE will refer to the courses that the researcher teaches, and EMI will refer to the content courses given by the content specialists.

Decisions to adopt EMI courses have been based on a variety of reasons and influences, such as the impelling forces of globalization (Coleman, 2006; Smit & Dafouz, 2012) in which English has become a lingua franca among international markets and other social communities (Crystal, 2003). Many universities have adopted EMI courses to fulfill mobility goals of the Bologna process.

Catalan and Spanish HE contexts have paralleled trends observed in the rest of Europe. Competition for student enrollments has had a further impact on decisions to include ICLHE in the curricula. Universities have sought to implement ICLHE courses in order to attract future domestic and international university students (Dafouz and Núñez, 2009), who are keenly aware of the language needs for promised employability.

Undergraduate degrees that include bilingual components were initially introduced in private tertiary institutions, such as the one where this research was carried out, in the mid-1990s, and have only more recently spread into the public

universities (Dafouz & Núñez, 2009). Decision-makers state that requiring a specific level of English for acceptance to certain programs adds prestige to the university status (personal communication). Research on outcomes and the experiences of ICLHE among stake-holders involved in its implementation remain varied (Dafouz & Núñez, 2009; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit, 2010; Costa & D'Angelo, 2011), suggesting that further investigation is necessary.

The Catalan HE context represents a more "linguistically complex" (Moore, 2016) region than many others. Internationalization policies have led to the promotion of the use of English as a lingua franca and as a vehicle for ICLHE context within already officially bilingual setting with Catalan (a minority language) and Spanish (a so-called global language) as the two official languages (Nussbaum, Moore & Borràs, 2013). Some studies outlining the language and multilingual policies, and the outcomes, related practices and stakeholders' perceptions, in Catalan universities have been reported (Llurda, Cots, & Armengol, 2013; Nussbaum et. al, 2013; Moore & Nussbaum, 2014; Moore, 2016). This research has analyzed the internationalization, teaching and language policies in Catalan universities within a context of internationalization. Their findings elucidated policies aimed at encouraging and reinforcing (at least) a trilingual context (Catalan, Spanish and English).

Within such an environment the notion of plurilingualism is relevant and represents a focal concept within the domain of multilingual education research and educational policy. According to Beacco (2005: 19) plurilingualism is "the capacity of individuals to use more than one language in social communication whatever their command of those languages". Other researchers have developed this notion towards a more interactional understanding rather than viewing plurilingualism merely as the acquisition of additional languages, each one an intact and separate system. These authors define plurilingual competence (Coste, Moore and Zarate 1997; 2009; Lüdi & Pi, 2009) as a non-static phenomenon, derived from various acquisition and learning processes, and have framed this repertoire in more socio-interactive terms: "The actors exploit these resources in a flexible and efficient way, depending on particular communicative situations, and this language use helps to shape activities" (Lüdi & Pi, 2009: 163).

Philosophies underpinning plurilingual learning and teaching practices orient towards language learned as comprising the use of communicative resources rather than objects to be internalized. Plurilingually competent interactants then: 1) draw from a repertoire of verbal resources that they have accumulated over the course of diverse experiences of language and acquisition, and 2) deploy their resources according to the social context in which they are engaged. Code-switching, for example, is understood as a legitimate practice in learning, conduct which is discouraged in monolingual approaches to language teaching. Research

in the area has demonstrated how plurilingual practices have the potential to serve as resources in ICLHE-type courses, to deepen understanding of the target content in these courses (Gajo & Berthoud, 2008; Gajo, Grobet, Serra, Steffen, Müller & Berthoud, 2013; Moore, 2014; Nussbaum, Moore & Borràs, 2013).

The literature regarding ICLHE and plurilingualism, particularly in Catalonia (e.g. that conducted by Nussbaum and her colleagues), is relevant to the research setting of the present thesis not only in geographical terms, but also in the considerations that are associated with a plurilingual environment. These plurilingual and interactional contextual features come into play when analyzing the types of resources students use to accomplish learning and the social activity in which the participants in this research are engaged — a collaborative project. The next section provides a background for this area of study.

1.3 Collaborative learning

The notion and practice of teamwork have become a prominent area of focus both in workplace and educational settings (Devece Peris-Ortiz, Merigó, & Fuster, 2015) Accompanying it, collaborative learning has been brought to the foreground as an effective approach to learning (Barnett, 2004). Collaborative learning is an umbrella term for many different methods for promoting peer learning situations (Duran, 2010; O'Donnell & Hmelo-Silver, 2013). The related methods of this approach entail learners engaging in various activities, such as group tasks or projects that are jointly executed. Collaborative learning can include approaches such as cooperative learning, which became popular in the 1980s, and is an instructional strategy comprising students working together in groups towards completing tasks through structured, shared learning objectives (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; O'Donnell & Hmelo-Silver, 2013). Another example is team-based learning (Fink, 2002; Michaelsen & Sweet, 2011), considered a type of cooperative learning, or a collaborative learning teaching strategy, for which permanent learning teams work together on class content over the course of the class time devoted to a certain unit or module.

Besides the learning value that these types of teaching approaches and methods are believed to foment, the assigning of collaborative projects has also increased in some HE contexts as a result of practical reasons. These include high numbers of students per class (Burdett, 2007; Davies, 2009; Jackson, 2014) and the demand for more formative approaches to assessment. Teachers are able to manage the teaching and evaluation of high numbers of students by means of collaborative projects. Such an advantage for the institution also translates into less access or a less prominent role of teachers in students' learning experience and more active participation by the students themselves and by their peers.

While the benefits of group work are hailed by education theorists and practitioners alike for a myriad of reasons, group work is not always as highly appreciated by students. Some studies regarding student perceptions of group work have elucidated some of the complexities involved in such collaborative tasks, such as work distribution, time constraints and communication-related difficulties (Burdett, 2003; Bently & Warwick, 2013; Jackson, 2014). Challenges related to the first two items (work distribution and time constraints) could be seen as manageable through more practical means, but overcoming communication barriers may require remedies that are less accessible to students. Hindrances to communication arise within a multitude of situations and can be related to varying levels of competence in linguistic and interactional behaviors.

Issues in communication among group work members might be intuitively expected, as might they be for any endeavor dependent on cooperation among multiple individuals. However, students are also expected by HE institutions to learn how to manage social and communicative obstacles that collaborative work may generate. Considerations for this aspect of learning are often explicitly reflected in evaluation systems as objects of learning. Assessment criteria related to students' abilities to work effectively in collaboration with others can be seen in the European Qualifications Framework (2010), which was established as an instrument to facilitate communication among European qualifications systems. Descriptors of lifelong learning outcomes in this rubric include competences related to working in teams or groups. Competences are evaluable behaviors that students are expected to demonstrate in their academic work.

The competences outlined by the European Qualifications Framework (2010: 3), which align with the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area as part of the Bologna Process, are the following:

- Take responsibility for managing professional development of individuals and groups.
- Take responsibility for contributing to professional knowledge and practice and/or reviewing the strategic performance of teams.

Methodologies that afford learning opportunities related to these competences, such as types of cooperative learning activity, have been included in new university curricula aiming to adapt to the Bologna process in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) plan (Devece, Peris-Ortiz, Merigó, & Fuster, 2015). This is the case in the research context of the present thesis. Competences regarding collaborative skills in teamwork are included in all courses across disciplines. In turn, many courses, and all ICLHE courses, include assessed collaborative learning activities.

Much has been reported about the collaborative approach to learning in terms of the strategies, benefits (O'Donnell & Hmelo-Silver, 2013), motivation (Rogat, Linnenbrink-García, & Barnes, 2013); assessment (Judd, Kennedy & Cropper, 2010), outcomes (van Boxtel, van der Linden, & Kaanselar, 2000; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Parente, & Bjorklund, 2001; Joseph & Payne, 2003) and student perceptions (Storch, 2005; Jareño, Jiménez & Lagos, 2014). More recently, the advantages of learning in small groups have been reported in the university setting (Jackson, 2014). These benefits include students' development of problem-solving skills, deeper learning and co-construction of knowledge (Burdett, 2007).

Within the Catalan university context, recent research dedicated to the study of face-to-face collaborative work among students has been carried out in ICLHE settings (Moore & Dooly, 2010; Moore, 2014; Borràs, Moore & Nussbaum, 2015). These studies looked at student interaction while working in groups within different learning situations. Findings elucidated plurilingual resources from which students may draw in order to achieve collaborative learning activity. Moore (2014), similar to the context of the present study, analyzed interaction outside of the classroom among students preparing for a presentation. The findings from this study shed light on the use of the students' plurilingual repertoires in the construction of knowledge and managing participation frameworks within that learning context.

Analyses of all of these studies were grounded in a conversation analysis (CA) theoretical and methodological framework, thereby illuminating a fitting approach to the study of interaction emerging within a collaborative activity and in a multilingual educational context.

In the next sections, CA research in collaborative learning and in multilingual settings will be reviewed to highlight the tradition that the current study follows and to which it seeks to contribute. Before reviewing this research area, a general overview of CA will be presented in section 1.4.

1.4 An overview of conversation analysis

The approach to human action and cognition, and the analytical design of the present study, is grounded in conversation analytical (CA) theory and methodology. Conversation analysis is considered "the dominant approach to the study of human social interaction across the disciplines of Sociology, Linguistics and Communication" (Stivers & Sidnell, 2013: 1). Though CA research is carried out across many disciplines, such as in Anthropology, Pyschology and Education, among others, it has its roots in the field Sociology (Stivers & Sidnell, 2013); the first scholars to contribute to CA were sociologists Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Their first CA-related publications appeared in the late

sixties and early seventies and were heavily influenced by Garfinkel's ethnomethodological approach to the study of human interaction (1967) and Goffman's notion of 'interaction order' (1983). These analytic traditions form foundational pillars of CA theory, which views social interaction as organized, rather than unorganized, random behavior, and meaning and actions constructed locally through shared, indexical actions by interactants.

The CA approach takes the position that social interaction is highly organized, and that this organization is based on jointly-understood methods that participants use to coordinate their actions towards the achievement of shared goals and meaning. These methods, comprising multimodal resources, are analyzed at a micro-level of interactions to study how interactants collaboratively construct actions and activities in naturally occurring conversations.

Analyses in CA research take an inductive approach and are carried out by transcribing the participants' talk, as well as multimodal interaction, from audio and/or video data. These transcripts provide empirical data that are studied to identify interactional phenomena and patterns. While CA researchers do not deny the existence of cognitive activity, they do not consider it to be something that can be empirically observed when conceptualized simply as a biological activity taking place within the human brain; researchers do not have visible access into the minds of others. Nor do the interactants have such access, but must display and interpret the actions observable to each other to reach a sense of understanding—one that is agreed upon—so that the ongoing activity may progress.

As interactants must make their actions recognizable to each other, these actions are also visible to analysts trained in the working of interactions. Researchers take an emic approach, rather than an etic one, to the analysis of social activity. In other words, they approach study of the interaction as can be seen emerging in the data and consider meaning from the perspective of the interactants according to their behaviors, rather than interpreting the data based on a priori categorizations of the types of actions observed.

The main basic areas of interaction organization that are studied in CA are related to turn-taking management, sequence organization, and repair. According to CA theory, elements that shape and constrain such structures are related to preference and also to orientations toward status or identity that is fluid and emergent within the interactions. Preference shapes the interaction by means of the actual sequential organization and turn design. Orientations to identity, as seen in stances towards participants' statuses, also mold interaction in similar ways.

Furthermore, as talk-in-interaction is situated in social activity, there are contextual features at work in the construction of the emerging actions. In CA, activity is observed in various, natural—or unrehearsed—interactions. However, Institutional CA relates to the natural interaction that unfolds within certain settings that have an omni-relevant, normative goal (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2005).

All of these methodological considerations make CA a fitting methodological approach to the present study, which situates cognition in social interaction, as it has been to other socio-interactionist research in other contexts of learning. For this study, learning is conceptualized in the socio-cultural/interactionist tradition as first and foremost a social activity, mediated in and accessible from social interaction (See chapter 2). Moreover, in the learning context of the present study, the student participants are expected to collaborate in a shared academic task; thus, CA is particularly useful in providing tools for understanding the complex organization of participation required for collaborative learning activities, an aspect to which this discussion now turns.

1.5 Conversation analysis and collaborative learning activity

A large body of research focusing on social interaction in educational settings, and also taking an empirical approach to the investigation of collaborative activity at the micro-level of interaction, has been grounded in conversation analysis (CA).

Conversation analysis considers cooperation as a mainstay in human social organization. It studies the interactional methods (such as the use of language, for example) that participants construct to coordinate their actions to achieve common goals. Such an approach is conducive to the study of collaborative actions among individuals working together towards the accomplishment of a joint project. The very nature of objectives considered for collaborative learning tasks, whose ultimate goal in an educational setting is to achieve learning, is about common social action.

Initially, CA-based research in the field of education mainly focused on the interactional practices that emerge among teachers and students as well as in student-to-student interaction in the general classroom setting. This area of study sought to analyze behaviors of the interactants to highlight the emerging participation patterns and make them recognizable as pertaining to the classroom and to the participants' identities within this context (Koole, 2012). Studies about interactional patterns related to known question-answer sequences (Mehan, 1979; Lee, 2006), corrections in trajectories of repair (McHoul, 1990; Zemel & Koschmann, 2011), and interactional resources deployed in courses of action

within reproach activity (Macbeth, 1990) among teachers and students in the classroom, have contributed to this line of research.

Meanwhile, a particular line of research in CA also developed that was concerned with interaction in second language learning environments, whether they be formal (e.g. classrooms) or otherwise, and it is to this line of CA to which the discussion now turns. It should be noted, however, that despite focusing on second language learning particularly, general CA and general CA educational research is foundational to such scholarship.

1.6 Conversation analysis and second language acquisition

In the last two decades, there has been an increasing interest in CA-based research in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) as analyzed in the classroom (Koole, 2012). This trend has paralleled the changes in practices seen in this discipline as they diverge from traditional, or lockstep language teaching (Gardner, 2013). Research in this domain analyzes interaction within the context of the learning of a language and focuses on interactional phenomena in learning accomplishment. Firth and Wagner's (1997) work is often cited as a catalyst in the re-conceptualization of SLA to integrate an understanding of learning as social action. The resulting line of research is grounded in the notion that interaction among teachers and students, or a type of collaborative learning activity, affords the situated and longitudinal opportunities for the acquisition of a language.

The relevance of such CA for SLA research to the present study lies in the focus on the notion of learning from a strongly social-interactionist perspective. This approach considers the learning process as social action and consequently brings the learners' actions and participation patterns to the foreground as the locus of their learning, or as constituting the learning process itself. Several researchers (Pekarek-Doehler, 2000; 2004; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2000; 2004; Markee, 2000; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Nussbaum & Unamuno, 2000; Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; He, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Moore, 2014) have promoted CA theory in the area of SLA and demonstrated the use of CA as a powerful analytical tool for the study of language learning. Pekarek and Mondada provided an analysis of the converging constructs between the socio-cultural (see Chapter 2) and conversation analytic theoretical frameworks to demonstrate the "complementarity of the two approaches" (2004: 504), and in turn, their use together to offer a model for the study of learning a language. Empirical analyses carried out by these authors, as well as by others (e.g. Nussbaum & Unamuno, 2000) and grounded in the socio-interactionist frameworks, show how students' interpretation of educational tasks shape and constrain collaborative interaction.

Markee (2000) pointed out that CA work has demonstrated the many different

types of interaction that arise in the classroom across diverse activities (one of them being group work) rather than prescribing singular categories of discourse between the instructor and the students. Such an observation suggests that there are varieties of interactional moves and sequences that constitute learning activity, and also that contextual features, like tasks or locally emerging identities, have a role in shaping the type of interaction that emerges, at the same time as they are also shaped in interaction.

In a special issue of the Modern Language Journal about CA for SLA, He (2004) outlined and exemplified the contributions (as well as limitations) that CA methodology can offer in the study of SLA. Among the items that she listed were the study of learning and teaching practices, oral language assessment and how education-related institutional identities are achieved. Some studies (Kasper, 2004; Brouwer, 2003; Mori, 2002; Mori & Hayashi, 2006) have looked at interactions between native and non-native speakers in different language learning activities. Some work has focused on teachers' recipient design in student-teacher sequences; Lazaraton (2004) studied embodied actions in recipient design by teachers as part of learning activity. Koshik (2002) studied teachers' uses of polar questions, or questions projecting an affirmative or negative response, in scaffolding practices in one-to-one writing conferences with university ESL students. The co-construction of instructor-initiated repair in the form of correction was analyzed by Rylander (2009) within a Chinese as a foreign language learning context.

1.7 Conversation analysis and interactional competence

Another line of research in CA for SLA has focused on interactional competence (IC) and taken a longitudinal approach to this phenomenon in diverse language learning contexts. In the field of SLA, interactional competence was initially brought to the forefront by Kramsch (1985) and Firth and Wagner (1997). These authors criticized the state of SLA research at that time for orienting towards a deficiency perspective of language learners' competences as compared to native speakers. Instead, these authors argued that researchers in the field of SLA should reconceptualize SLA research to focus on the dynamic and collaborative nature of language learning and the resources that learners' deploy effectively in their interactions carried out in a foreign language. In so doing, they also questioned the formulation of learning goals as aiming for native speaker status.

Interactional competence can be said to comprise resources that participants deploy to achieve shared goals beyond purely linguistic practices. Hall and Pekarek-Doehler (2011: 1) define it as, "the context-specific constellations of expectations and dispositions about our social works that we draw on to navigate our way through our interactions with others". Interactional competence, then,

refers to an ability to coordinate actions with others. This notion is a particularly useful tool in forging a framework for the study of SLA. The longitudinal or developmental dimensions of IC studies conceptualize learning as changing in doing (Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011).

Like the domain of longitudinal CA for SLA, IC research has been carried out in a wide range of learning settings. Young and Miller (2004), for example, studied how instructors and students co-constructed changes in their participation, eventually leading to a student's fuller participation in the revision of his writing. Some studies have analyzed the development of IC over time within language learning contexts outside of the classroom. Ishida (2009) and Theodordóttir (2011) carried out case studies of university students and followed their development of IC over the course of their stays abroad. Sahlström (2011) also followed a case of a child learning to interact in a new multilingual setting.

Though the present research is not longitudinal, these studies are relevant in their focus on a broad array of interactional practices used by learners in a multilingual context. The participants in this analysis interacted in their third language. Therefore, the studies such as those listed focusing on what the students can do interactively, rather than focusing on their linguistic limitations in their L3, is relevant in this context.

1.8 Conversation analysis and group work among peers

Interaction that emerges within the context of group work activity among peers has been an object of inquiry in CA-informed research; nevertheless, most of the related research has been within teacher-led classroom settings (Koole, 2012). Research focusing on peer-to-peer interaction has studied students engaged in collaborative types of learning tasks.

Ohta (2000) studied peer-assistance, or scaffolding practices (see chapters 2 and 6)—particularly in bids for assistance and corrections—used among L2 learners and their progress in learning Japanese, as they engaged in collaborative tasks. Antón and DiCamilla (1998) studied the use of L1 among peers in carrying out learning tasks together. Aline and Hosoda (2009) found that peers in L2 learning situations (small group discussions) focused more on actions rather than language code in repair sequences. Hellerman (2011) analyzed changes in interaction competence related to other-initiated repair sequences among classroom adult learners of English, and explored what they considered as repairable. Within such sequences, interactants' orientations towards their statuses as language learners were visible.

Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004) analyzed interaction among students

carrying out group work in the classroom and focused on how the students' emerging interpretation of the task shaped these interactions. Markee (2004) and Mori (2004) also studied students working in groups in the classroom and considered off-task interaction, again highlighting the variety of interaction that can occur within a learning setting. Markee (2004) and Sharma (2013) also examined interaction among university students working in small groups during class time, and elucidated the emerging teacher and student identities within participation frameworks with and without teacher intervention. A study by Singto (2005) analyzed interaction among students participating in peer writing activity. The findings of this study indicated students' orientations towards and management of the identities played a part in the accomplishment of the collaborative task. A recent CA study by Jakonen and Morton (2013) analyzed epistemics in the interactional management of knowledge gaps among peers working in a small group in a secondary school setting. The findings of this study showed students discovering and attending to their own learnables that emerged in their interactions.

These studies are particularly relevant to the present research as they represent findings in peer-to-peer interaction within a multilingual learning context. Furthermore, they demonstrate orientations towards learning as a social action that can arise in a wide variety of settings and within different learning tasks.

1.9 Conversation analysis and Integrated Content and Language in Higher Education

Along the lines of CA for SLA in terms of its focus on interaction in learning processes in a multilingual setting, is recent work in the area of Integrated Content and Language Learning in Higher Education (ICLHE) in the European context.

Conversation analytic research within the ICLHE context is fairly recent and has particularly centered on plurilingual interaction in learning settings. Gajo (2013) analyzed classroom interaction in a university settings in Switzerland, which has a long tradition of plurilingual education, and demonstrated the beneficial use of different languages in the construction of knowledge process. Similar findings from research drawing from a CA approach were also reported in a Catalan context (Moore, 2014).

Conversation analytic research in Catalan ICLHE university settings has focused on the uses of plurilingual repertoires for constructing meaning in HE subjects where English is the medium of instruction. Findings from this line of research (Moore, Borràs, & Nussbaum; 2013; Moore, 2014; Borrás, Moore, & Nussbaum, 2015) found plurilingual resources to be beneficial in EMI courses. Of note, code-switching behavior was shown to be an effective resource even though such

practices have been seemingly discouraged as noted in Catalan university language policies, according to the authors.

The studies listed above demonstrated how plurilingual resources are deployed in the achievement of goals in interaction in various classroom university settings, including learning goals in ICLHE class settings. At the same time, they further indicate that CA has gained an established footing in the education field and in studies of language learning and of language and content learning. However, in comparison to the relatively large body of research that has been carried out about students interacting in collaborative tasks within classrooms in an additional language, quite little research analyzes interaction among students collaborating in groups in their L3 outside of the classroom, without the physical presence of a teacher. It is to this research to which the discussion now turns.

1.10 Conversation analysis and learning among peers outside of the classroom

Conversation analytical research that has analyzed student-to-student interactions in group work outside of the classroom is available, but it is more scarce than that carried out within a classroom setting. A study by Sawyer and Berson (2004) studied the collaborative discourse among university students participating in a peer-led, small study group, though in this study, the students interacted in their first language, English. Moore (2014) analyzed talk-in-interaction in a third language among a group of international Psychology students in a multilingual university setting as the interactants prepared for a classroom presentation. Though this study did not focus on the extra-classroom setting, the findings indicated competence in the deployment of plurilingual resources used in the co-construction of knowledge without the presence of a language or content specialist.

Jauni and Niemelä (2014) reported on the interaction among university students carrying out an academic task in an additional language outside of class in the form of a video conference. The researchers demonstrated that the participants with varying linguistic competences were able to interact competently with the content and manage the task at times drawing from plurilingual resources such as language alternation. Code-switching in this setting represented a learning opportunity for the interactants. Again, while the focus of this research was not explicitly on the outside of class setting, the peers were seen to accomplish the learning task effectively without the presence of the teacher.

More recently, a CA for SLA focused study by Reichert (2016) examined the interaction of a small group of university German language students who were

preparing for a speaking test. The participants practiced a role-play in a meeting outside of class.

All of these studies listed in this section have highlighted the opportunities that learning situations entailing peer interaction outside of class can afford. Furthermore, the research contexts and methodology outlined in this line of research were similar to those of the present study.

The previous ten sections of this chapter have introduced some of the research that contextualizes the research and the fields to which the present study may contribute. In the following section, the objectives and specific questions to be answered in this thesis are presented.

1.11 Research objectives and questions

It is the aim of the present study to contribute to the growing field of research that further elucidates how social interaction unfolds among peers in a collaborative learning situation outside of the classroom in a multilingual HE context. It also aims to contribute to an understanding of the learning opportunities that such a learning context and the emerging interaction have the potential to create. In doing so, conversation analysis is employed as a guiding theoretical approach to analyze data collected by the researcher, who was also the teacher of the learning context studied. This being so, the thesis may be broadly framed within practitioner research.

More specifically, the present study aimed to explore: 1) what interaction among university students engaged in carrying out a collaborative task within a multilingual setting outside of class looks like, and 2) in what ways the collaborative task affords opportunities for the students' co-construction of knowledge in language and content. Note that the notion 'task' is understood in a broad sense, to refer to a semi-structured learning endeavor, with certain objectives, content, and work procedures that are at least partially defined a priori, although resulting a range of outcomes (Breen, 1987: 23). In the process of engaging in tasks, learners undertake a range of interactional activities, that structure interactional sequences and projects. Such unfolding interactional organization is the main focus of this thesis.

The specific objectives and their corresponding research questions that drove this project are addressed in eight analytical chapters, which are divided into three sections, each with different foci. The following list presents the objectives and questions that each of these analytical chapters attends to. Note that all of the chapters draw from the same data corpus, analyzing the data through different lenses.

Objective 1: To describe the interaction among students engaged in carrying out a collaborative task within a multilingual university setting outside of class.

1. *How do students interpret the task in which they are engaged?*
    i. *How do the students make visible their interpretations of the task?*
    ii. *Towards what elements of the task do the interactants orient as being relevant in its achievement?*
    iii. *How do interactants negotiate and achieve a collective understanding of their activities?*

These questions are mainly attended to in Analysis Part 1, Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

2. *In what type of emerging and reoccurring activities do the students engage over the course of their task meeting or meetings?*
    i. *How are the observed activities differentiated?*
        i.i. What is the general organizational structure of the sequences within these activities?
        i.ii. What are the interactional behaviors within the context of the identified activities?
    ii. *How are these activities managed?*
        ii.i. How do the participants manage the shifting from one type of activity to the other?
        ii.ii How is the interaction within these sequences managed?
        ii.iii What reoccurring phenomena shape and constrain the participation patterns observed?
        ii.iv What artifacts come into play?

These questions are mainly attended to in Analysis Part 2, Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

Objective 2: to explore whether the activities in which the students engage during their task meetings afford learning opportunities towards the students' co-construction of language and content knowledge.

1. *What type of collaborative learning opportunities, if any, are present in a setting in which a teacher is not physically present?*
    i. *How are learning opportunities oriented to by interactants in the course of their unfolding activities?*
    ii. *What types of interactional sequences are more conducive to learning-type behavior?*
    iii. *How do learners coordinate their actions in such a way as to facilitate learning-type behavior?*

2. *In what ways can the researcher, as a teaching practitioner, further enrich this learning context and encourage meaningful learning activity?*

Though these questions are omnipresent throughout this entire thesis, Question 1 is explicitly attended to in Chapter 10, and Question 2 will be further discussed in Chapter 11 as a reflection based on all the data analyses presented.

The other chapters making up this thesis are Chapter 2, which describes the specific theoretical framework guiding the analyses, Chapter 3, which outlines the methodology followed and Chapter 11, which discusses the findings and conclusions.

1.12 Motivations

Given the more personal nature of this section, it shall be written in first person. The present study is a result of my desire as a HE teacher to reach a deeper understanding of how the ICLHE program I teach on can enhance students' learning and my own and my colleagues' teaching experiences, and change attitudes towards teaching and learning within and outside of our classrooms. The ICLHE program I teach on has formed an important part of the different faculties' overall curricula at our university for many years. The collaboration between our ICLHE courses and more specific content subjects is explicit not only in our course guidelines, but also in the type of content that we treat in the ICLHE courses. This collaborative relationship across disciplines requires constant reflection by teachers and development of our course design, materials, learning tasks and objectives, which make our educational context innovative and challenging. This also means that close monitoring of how our practices and activities develop to ensure that the learning context does indeed constitute a rich learning environment is needed.

The main and unique ways that we, as teachers, have felt that our courses could contribute to the students' education at our university is by providing a space where students can: 1) critically discuss and interact with various areas of their degree content, and thereby 2) develop their professional discourse and interactional competence in another language. Our teachers' perceptions, emerging from regular reflective practices, have been very positive regarding the benefits of our constantly evolving methodology and course designs. However, actual student learning experiences have not been systematically studied within our educational setting.

As our university has increasingly set more ambitious goals for further EMI and ICLHE courses, some directors, teachers and students have expressed concern about learners' abilities to successfully achieve academic objectives. My own experience indicates that students, in fact, have the capacity to accomplish complex academic activities, despite perceived limitations generated in certain exolingual (e.g. Alber & Py, 1985) situations. In my work with students who have had very limited experience using the English language in academic settings, I have witnessed competent interaction with, and treatment of, newly introduced discipline-specific content. Some of these students have reported reaching a better understanding of the content as well as of the (English) language in this process.

Based on my own educational background and experience in Applied Linguistics, as well as my perceptions regarding the benefits of the teaching/learning methodology promoted in my practice, I was motivated to carry out research to learn how to better understand and also evaluate the ways that students actually carry out the type of activities that we develop as part of our syllabus. Such research would potentially not only have implications for my own practices as a teacher, but it would also provide an ontological and epistemological framework for transformation in my own beliefs and approaches regarding the social activities in which I interact on a daily basis within this learning context. My engaging in research has also had a contagious effect, with several of my colleagues undertaking studies of their own. All of this has contributed to our personal and professional growth as individuals and as a teaching team.

1.13 Summary

This chapter has sought to contextualize the present study by providing a brief introduction to the educational setting in which the study was carried out, reviewing literature and research findings relevant to the learning situation studied, outlining the research objectives and questions that this research enterprise aims to address, and also by describing the motivation underlying this project.

The literature reviewed has addressed the complex nature of current university environments as a learning context. It has also shown that learning is a social activity, and that the learning process is shaped by and shapes interaction that unfolds among participants. Collaborative approaches to learning could afford rich learning opportunities for students, and this premise has been demonstrated in previous studies. Collaborative tasks can also be effectively carried out among peers outside of the classroom. That is, students can achieve some academic objectives without the physical presence of the teacher, though this phenomenon has not been the main focus of most of the research reported. Furthermore, conversation analysis has been shown to provide a coherent theoretical approach

and a powerful methodological tool-kit in the study of interaction that emerges within such contexts.

The following chapter (Chapter 2), describes the theoretical framework for the present research, and Chapter 3 outlines the methodology. Chapters 4 through 10 present the data analyses, and finally Chapter 11 discusses the findings and related implications as well as recommendations for future directions.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework

While the research presented in Chapter 1, particularly the scholarship related to learning and CA, is relevant to the present study, Chapter 2 explains further notions that are central to the analytical sections of this thesis. This chapter discusses Socio-cultural and Interactionist theory, which provides a framework for analyses related to learning activity. Theoretical constructs and phenomena related to Conversation Analysis are also explicated, specifically, participation frameworks and footing, suggestion and proposal activity, and epistemics (status, stance, rights and obligations). Much of the discussion in this chapter is dedicated to suggestions and proposals, as they are a recurring interactional pattern in the data studied, they frame many of the other aspects analyzed and they have received little discussion in the field of Education.

2.1 Socio-cultural and interactionist theory, learning and conversation analysis

This section begins by presenting theory that guides the analyses of the present research regarding learning activity. Learning in this research is conceptualized within a socio-interactionist perspective.

As was discussed in Chapter 1, the present study is grounded in the CA research tradition. The argument for studying learning processes by means of CA and socio-interactionist informed analyses has been compellingly outlined and demonstrated by Pekarek-Doehler (2000; 2002; 2010), Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler (2000, 2004). Work by these authors has some overlaps with research inspired by Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of 'situated learning', which conceptualizes learning as an evolving process generated in social interaction, or participation in 'communities of practice'.

Mondada and Pekarek's research explores converging tenets that underpin both socio-cultural and CA theoretical traditions and that highlight the complementary nature of their relationship. These authors propose that if higher thinking processes, such as learning, are understood as being inextricable from participation in social activity (see the overview of Vygotksy's theory of cognitive development in 2.1.1), a CA approach has the capacity to effectively capture emerging phenomena that constitute social interaction and thus cognition. The present study, therefore, adopts a CA perspective in the analysis of interactional phenomena, rather than merely employing its methodology for this purpose.

The rationale for having taken a socio-interactionist perspective for the interpretative processes in this thesis also relates directly to the data-driven

aspect of the present research. Once the initial analysis (see Chapter 5) of this study was completed by means of CA-methodology, thereby making recurring suggestion sequences visible, emerging behaviors related to learning were also observed (see Chapter 6). Several moves that could be interpreted as containing scaffolding behaviors were identified in a second analysis of the suggestion sequences. This concept, scaffolding is strongly related to socio-cultural theory (see section 2.1.2 below).

In the following sections, some concepts, including scaffolding and participation, related closely to the socio-interactionist research program are discussed. The chapter then focuses on other notions, such as suggestions and proposals or epistemics. The latter have received much less attention in research in the area of this thesis, but are paramount to understanding the interactions studied and help broaden the theoretical lens for comprehending how learning is situated and co-constructed.

2.1.1 Learning, mediation and the Zone of Proximal Development

This socio-interactionist theory of learning that this study is grounded in views learning as a strongly situated and socially mediated activity, achieved and made visible in interaction. Socio-interactionist theory is informed by a Vygotskian or socio-cultural conceptualization of cognitive development, which situates the genesis of learning primarily on the social plane, rather than in internal and individualistic mental processes.

The major theoretical contribution put forth by Vygotsky (1978, 1986) relates to the notion of *mediation*. Higher thinking does not consist in a direct relationship between individuals and conceptual objects, but is rather mediated by interaction with others and by socially formed artifacts (such as spoken and written language). In this regard, the Vygotskian notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is fundamental to understanding the developmental approach to learning in the socio-cultural framework. Rather than being concerned with the cognitive tasks that individuals can achieve on their own, the ZPD helps conceptualize what he or she has the potential of doing through mediation, or interaction with others, and the social world.

The ZPD, according to Vygotsky is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (1978: 86)". This definition reflects the contingent nature of interaction, in that the adult or more capable peer's actions are conditional to the child's stage of development, as seen through his or her behavior.

Pekarek Doehler (2002) took the concept of mediation further by reconceptualizing it within a more interactional framework, inspired by CA. She expanded the notion of mediation, reframing it as an activity that is itself accomplished through social interaction. Her definition of mediation was formulated as comprising the following three dimensions: a *reciprocity-oriented* notion of mediation; a *context-sensitive* and *context-producing* notion of mediation; and finally, a *culture-related* notion of mediation (Pekarek Doehler, 2002: 17).

The reciprocal dimension of Pekarek Doehler's understanding of mediation relates to the bi-directional and collaboratively constructed mediation process, where it is not only the teacher or expert who shapes activity for the learner. The context-sensitive and context-producing aspect of this framework refers to actions that interactants carry out to achieve intersubjectivity , or "the shared grasp of the talk and the other conduct in the interaction" (Schegloff, 1992: 1300) within a learning situation. And finally, the culture-related notion of mediation considers use of "communicative culture and experience" (2002: 17) as a means for mediation.

Pekarek Doehler's work has important implications for our understanding of how activity in a learning setting is accomplished. Learning activity and tasks are realized collaboratively, and participation in learning enterprises comprises continuous reciprocal re-creation of activities and tasks based on the emerging interpretations of all the interactants involved (both teachers' and learners'). These notions are further discussed and analyzed in Mondada and Pekarek Doehler's (2004) research. Their study demonstrated the multi-layeredness of learning tasks, which they found to be collaboratively constructed, carried out by means of various competences, and often leading to diverse learning opportunities.

Other researchers have studied interactional phenomena related to participants' actions and orientations in their accomplishment of shared goals and contexts of learning. Nussbaum and Unamuno (2000) observe the resources that language learners deploy in the process of carrying out a communicative learning task. Though the students in their study had fairly limited linguistic competence, they were able to draw from various resources to co-construct actions, such as the negotiation of roles or reformulations, that in turn helped constitute the task at hand. Seedhouse (2005) also addresses this understanding of learning task achievement in his paper on this topic. In his work, Seedhouse used the concept of 'task-as-workplan' put forward by Breen (1987), which is the pre-conceived plan for implementing the intended learning outcomes of a task. He argues that this static understanding of task was prominent in SLA research. Task-as-workplan differs from a 'task-in-process', a notion also put forward previously by Breen, in that this conceptualization of task takes into account how the task is actually interpreted and carried out. The accomplishment of a task, according to this definition, is analyzed in Seedhouse's work through an interactionist and emic

perspective that draws in CA. Analysis of task construction from this approach takes into account emerging interactional conduct and perspectives of all participants' in learning activity—not merely the teacher's.

These theoretical constructs are relevant to the analysis of the present study, which also takes into account the socially constructed meditational behaviors observed in the data. The learning activity and tasks are explicitly negotiated and managed by all the participants, turn by turn, and are analyzed in depth in Chapters 4 through 6. The students' orientations towards various aspects of the learning activity represent a constitutive element that generates a fluid and complex interactional context. Analysis of learners' actions and interpretations of the task at a micro-level, therefore, affords a clearer understanding of how learners actually accomplish the learning task that was assigned to them.

2.1.2 Scaffolding

A related term, and one that is often confounded with that of mediation, is *scaffolding*. It is related to the support given to learners in achieving cognitively challenging tasks. This metaphor, taken from the construction domain, was applied in the area of teaching and learning and popularized by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) to describe the practices that adults perform to help children achieve tasks that they might not be capable of completing without assistance. Wood et al. emphasized that the effective support provided by the tutor is grounded in his or her understanding of the task and its related procedures. It is also grounded in a tutor's observation and response to the child's actual performance of the task, to monitor their unfolding performance, in order to respond and provide a type of assistance the situation requires. Another key feature of the scaffolding metaphor is related to the temporary use of a structure, or support, until the child can ultimately do the task without assistance.

Scaffolding behavior is the focus of the analysis presented in Chapter 6. A brief literature review of relevant research in this area will not be provided. The tools, or rubrics, that guide the analysis of the scaffolding activity observed in the data will also be presented.

Two commonly cited classifications of scaffolding activities are the ones developed by Wood et al. (1976) and Tharp and Gallimore (1988). These classifications are organized according to the function (Wood et al., 1976), or the actions the scaffolding actions are presumed to fulfill, or according to the "means of assisting performance" (Tharp and Gallimore, 1988:44). Later rubrics have been developed (see Many, 2002 and Silliman, Bahr, Beasman, & Wilkinson, 2000) that focus on so-called scaffolding strategies. These classifications focus more on the goals and intentions of practitioners. These systems also take a more cognitivist perspective

in identifying scaffolding activity, while Wood et al. (1976) and Tharp and Gillmore's (1988) classifications are based on actions, or methods observed in interaction. The related descriptors (presented below) are more consistent with the theory around which the present study is organized, although caution is needed to ensure an emic approach to the data rather than a simple application of theory, as shall be discussed further below and in Chapter 6.

The analyses of scaffolding behavior in this thesis are mainly based on the classification developed by Wood et al. (1976: 98) who reported the following functions observed as adults helped children complete learning tasks:

1. Recruitment, which refers to getting the attention of the participant who is carrying out the task.
2. Reduction of degrees of freedom, which is the tutor's structuring of the task to reduce its complexity.
3. Direction maintenance, by which the individual is kept engaged in the task process.
4. Marking critical features, which is when the tutor highlights elements of the task that are applicable to the current stage of the process in which the individual is engaged; Wood et al. (1978) give as an example the tutor's drawing the child's attention to the discrepancy between his or her performance and that which would be considered appropriate.
5. Frustration control, which is related to stress management or techniques to 'save face' as perceived errors arise.
6. Demonstration, which refers to the modeling of possible ways to accomplish the task. Wood et al. (1978: 98) explain that this function "may involve completion or even explication of a solution already partially executed by the tutee him/herself. In this sense, the tutor is 'imitating' in idealized form an attempted solution tried (or assumed to be tried) by the tutee in the expectation that the learner will then 'imitate' it back in a more appropriate form."

Tharp and Gallimore's (1988:44) classification will be referred to with less frequency. Their 'means of assisting performance' include the following elements:

1. Modeling, which is similar to Wood's et al.'s item number 6, or demonstration.
2. Contingency managing, which relates to responses to behavior to display a positive or negative stance towards the previous action.
3. feeding back, which is providing input to the learner's performance
4. Instructing, usually a type of directive action that projects a demand for an action.
5. Questioning, which refers to a dialectical type of performance assistance
6. Cognitive structuring, which according to Tharp and Gallimore (1988: 63), it "assists by providing explanatory and belief structures that organize and justify". This action makes reasoning processes visible.

An example of scaffolding behaviors in a learning setting among peers can be seen in the following extract, which is presented in Chapter 8 (Extract 8-7). In this excerpt, the students Laura, Rita and Gabriela have been discussing Laura's script. Laura gives a suggestion regarding the wording that Rita could use.

Extract 2-1

```
1   LAU:    you c-
2           you can only mention it
3           as as loli said uh
            ((Loli is a nickname for Laura))
4           there are two-
5           two:o [(xxx)]
6  RIT:           [okay so le-]
7           ((gets whiteboard eraser and turns to erase her drawing))
8  LAU:     of the
9           of the slot size
10 RIT:     let me practice that
```

In line 1, Laura suggests an action that Rita might take up for her presentation part (*you can only mention it*). She articulates a candidate script using quoted speech in Lines 3-5 and 9). This turn can be considered a scaffold as it demonstrates (using Wood et al.'s classification, Item 6) or models (using Tharpe and Gallimore's classification, Item 1) to assist Rita in the achievement of developing her script.

In line 6, Rita displays her alignment and affiliation with Laura's suggestion, and projects an intention to take up the proposal. She is seen to accept this assistance, and in fact later builds on Laura's scaffold to accomplish the presentation of this content.

Wood et al.'s study observed scaffolding behaviors among adults assisting children, while Tharp and Gallimore actually studied these behaviors in an educational (i.e. elementary school) setting. It was Cazden (1979) who initially related Vygotsky's notion of the ZPD with scaffolding and proposed extending these two concepts to classroom interaction between teachers and students. Stone (1993) also drew from Vygotsky's work and emphasized the fluid nature of the interaction related to scaffolding activity, thereby highlighting the participation of the learner, not just the teacher's contributions, within this emerging joint-meaning-making process (Stone, 1998a; 1998b).

A 2010 systematic review on scaffolding research (van de Pol Volman & Beishuizen, 2010) found that while agreement on an actual definition of scaffolding has been elusive over the last few decades, three commonly reported aspects of scaffolding activity were identifiable. The first shared characteristic in various reported definitions of scaffolding was *contingency*. A teacher acts contingently when she or he adapts the support in one way or another to a (group of) student(s). The second common characteristic they detected was *fading*, which was the gradual 'dismantling' of the scaffolding. This stage of the scaffolding process is tied to the third common characteristic: the *transfer of responsibility*. The management and actual performance of a task is progressively and responsively handed over to the learner.

Over time, scaffolding has been re-conceptualized to include peer, collective or mutual scaffolding—scaffolding among peers with symmetrical or similar levels of competences and conceptual understanding (Fernández, Wegerif, Mercer, & Rojas-Drummond, 2001). Donato (1994) and Guerrero and Villamil (2000) carried out micro-genetic studies (the methodology forwarded by Vygotsky for studying learning as it unfolded) among peers doing group work in their second language in university settings. These studies demonstrated how students with similar access to the conceptual and behavioral knowledge needed can mutually support each other's progress on difficult problem-solving tasks that they might not be able to do on their own. The findings also indicate that scaffolding behavior in a learning context among peers is dynamic and continuing—involving many micro-level problem-solving sequences. Scaffolding is not based on stable or unchanging participant statuses and unidirectional relationships where one is always the expert and the other the novice.

A recent study by Devos (2016) analyzed interaction among peers in a CLIL context. This researcher studied the interaction among first and secondary school students as they participated in a Physical Education CLIL course. He studied scaffolding activity related to both language and content and found that scaffolding can be carried out by multiple peers, and that the identity of expert can be distributed among many when helping a peer to achieve understanding. Devos (2016: 141) defines *language scaffolding* as "observable oral support provided by an expert to a novice so that intersubjectivity can be maintained and talk-in-interaction may continue". *Content scaffolding* then, according to Devos (2016: 142), "refers to sequences in which a novice participant receives support from an expert peer or peers on content-related issues." He further explicates a third type of scaffolding conduct, which he coins as binary scaffolding. This term reflects scaffolding activity carried out among "equal peers scaffolding each other's knowledge in content *and* language" (2016: 142-143) in a sequence, in which the group members draw from collective resources to jointly resolve knowledge gaps in both language and content. Defining these different types of scaffolding contexts allowed the research to focus on the objects of trouble to which the participants oriented when initiating sequences in which scaffolding behaviors emerged. This is relevant to a CLIL-type of context, which explicitly promotes learning of language and content. Within the context of the present study, the pedagogical approach to the task in which interactants are engaged includes a similar dual focus.

Though Devos referred to novices vs. experts, he emphasized that these statuses were transitory and often shared. The findings from Devos' study indicated that students in this CLIL setting oriented towards the content of the task more often than towards the language aspect — a finding also discussed by Moore (2011) in her research on higher education CLIL in Catalonia. Hence scaffolding activity related to language was less frequent, less complex and more 'on the fly' in Devos'

(2016: 141) study, in order to maintain progressivity of the current speaker's turn. Episodes of binary scaffolding were observed with even less frequency. Scaffolding behavior related to content issues, by contrast, was more elaborate in nature and within longer sequences treating the object of attention.

Devos posited that peers might be in a better position than teachers to provide some types of scaffolding, as they share more common ground. In turn, they have a good perspective of each other's ZPD, so that they can provide appropriate support to help each other maintain intersubjectivity, or the display of mutual understanding.

It is important to note that the present study analyzes emerging scaffolding *behaviors*. In other words, the emerging activity identified as scaffolding behavior was not considered in isolation to interaction, or to be an intentional or even a conscious activity involving teacher and students and students. Rather, emerging scaffolding behaviors are considered to be contingent and situated interactional orientations, arising as a consequence of and in a reflexive relationship with the unfolding interactional context and the learning activity at hand.

Furthermore, this study will not address whether the behaviors identified in these sequences pertaining to scaffolding practices actually lead to long-term learning. Such a study would require a more longitudinal, tracking type of analysis (Markee, 2008; Moore, 2014; Ploettner 2015; Pekarek Doehler & Fasel Lauzon, 2015). Rather the present study will focus on how scaffolding activity is collaboratively carried out in the specific learning context studied and can create spaces for potential learning (De Pietro, Matthey, & Py, 1989; Krafft & Dausendschön-Gay, 1994; Gardner, 2008).

In this section, the notion of scaffolding has been explained as it is central to this study. Scaffolding behaviors are observable within the suggestion sequences that emerge within the interactions among the participants during their meetings. As mentioned in Chapter 1 (Section 1.11), the suggestion sequences will be analyzed in Chapters 8 and 9, while Scaffolding behaviors will be analyzed within these same sequences in Chapter 10.

2.2 Participation frameworks and footing

Erving Goffman was considered a strong influence in the development of CA. According to his book, Forms of Talk (1981), in which he outlines theoretical models of participation, *footing* is a construct that relates to how participants make sense of the interaction they are engaged in as it unfolds. Within his analysis of participation frameworks, or the relative status that participants orient to and display within an interaction occasion, Goffman (1981: 128) described the concept

of footing as a "participant's alignment, or set, or stance, or posture, or projected self". Footings change across interactions, shifting as interactants manage their discourse as it emerges throughout the interactional event.

To illustrate, Goffman applied the footing construct within various frames, or interactional contexts. Within the analysis of the lecture framework, he proposed a model of understanding that encompasses the different layers of identities associated with speaker status within the interactional structure of a lecture: they are the *animator*, or, the 'talking machine' that actually produces the sound; the *author* of the message delivered; and the *principal*, or representative who is socially responsible for the message. Goffman further elaborates his description of the participation framework to address the normative expectations related to a speaker's authority status in relation to the audience. He writes that a lecturer "is assumed to have knowledge and experience in textual matters, and of this considerably more than that possessed by the audience" (1981: 167).

Goodwin (2006; see also Mondada & Nussbaum, 2012) built on Goffman's analysis of participation to include more focus on hearers' activity as well as a further emphasis on the emerging nature of participation: "participation can be analyzed as a temporally unfolding process through which separate parties demonstrate to each other their ongoing understanding of the events they are engaged in by building actions that contribute to the further progression of these very same events" (Goodwin, 2006: 25).

These theoretical concepts provide solid grounds for an analysis of the interactions seen in the data of the present study, in particular, interaction arising within the context of students' collaborative efforts in preparation for an oral presentation. While the interaction consists in group work, not a lecture, students are projecting to a lecture-type activity in the future.

If we contextualize a group oral presentation, such as the one to be given by the students in this study, within Goffman's model, the animator identity would be displayed by the individual rehearser, or presenter. In the cases described in this study, the rehearsers were also the original authors of their scripts and PowerPoint slides, or *text* as Goffman describes a lecturer's discourse. In terms of the explicit task requirements, however, all of the members of the group would occupy the principal identity. They all represent the presentation and the knowledge objects as a whole. The footing model thus provides a solid starting point for the analysis of the layers of participation frameworks that emerge throughout the recorded meeting interactions.

At the same time, both Goffman's and particularly Goodwin's stress on the inherently transient and non-static character of participation frameworks afford a

more accurate fit for the analytical lens used to observe the shifting footings identified throughout interactions in this study. Grounded in these theoretical concepts, the participation patterns and interactants' interpretations in regards to doing rehearsing were revealed in the video data of this study. These constructs especially facilitate analyses of framework shifts between rehearsal activity and suggestion sequences as membership categories emerging in each footing are strikingly different.

An example of such a footing shift can be seen in the following extract, which is analyzed in depth in Chapters 5 (Extract 5-11) and in Chapter 10 (Extract 10-1). In this extract, Laia is rehearsing her part of their group oral presentation. She has been given the floor to read her script while her co-presenters, Cristina and Rosa (who does not speak in this excerpt) listen. The computer screen in front of Laia contains the PowerPoint presentation, and they have gazing at it until Cristina asks Laia a question.

Extract 2-2

```
1  LAI:     an anterior bite ↓↑planes .ah
            ((gazing at the computer screen))
2  CRI:     how many:y (.)
            ((Laia looks at Cristina))
3           plates we have.
```

The participation framework in which Laia rehearses is different from the one in which Cristina speaks. Until then, all talk except Laia's has been suspended. The co-participants have all focused their attention on the PowerPoint. Cristina uses a question to shift the footing to one in which she can participate by speaking as well. In the shifting process, their behaviors change. Their gazes turn towards each other. Furthermore, the change in participation framework is not achieved in one abrupt turn. Cristina initiates the change in Line 2, but waits for Laia to align with her action before she continues. Laia's alignment is indicated by her change in gaze direction from the computer to Cristina.

As mentioned above, this extract will be analyzed in Chapters 5 and 10. For now it serves to operationalize the notions related to footing as described above.

2.3 Suggestions and Proposals

In this section, the social actions related to suggestion and proposal actions and activity will be described. This description, rooted in a CA theoretical framework, will include definitions, a literature review and examples from the data of the present study. Concepts and phenomena related to suggestions and proposals are central to the first analysis presented in Chapters 8 and 9, in which suggestion sequences emerging within the students' group work interaction are analyzed. Interpretations of the data showing interactions that emerge within the projects

that are constructed towards the achievement of proposal activity must be informed by an in-depth understanding of the nature of suggestion actions themselves.

2.3.1 Definition of suggestions and proposals

There is little published literature about suggestion sequences per se (but see Mandelbaum, 1992**;** Li, 2010). Rather, suggestions tend to be categorized as a type of proposal (Maynard, 1984), about which there are also fewer publications as compared to other interactional actions, such as requests, assessments and repairs, among others. While some authors list proposals alongside suggestions, which reflects a belief that they are differentiated actions, others use the terms interchangeably. In this study, the terms proposal and suggestion are used interchangeably, but the action and sequences of analysis will be named *suggestion*, to contextualize them as emerging action rather than the result of a previously crafted plan that is presented for an pre-established, official occasion, such as proposals for research grants or company budgets. Asmuß and Oshima (2012) cite Maynard (1984) , who suggested that the sparse literature in this area might be due to the fact that proposals are used to do so many different things.

Proposals and suggestions have been likened to social actions such as requests, offers and invitations, among others (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990). Brown and Levinson (1987) contextualize suggestions within their politeness theory framework in terms of their potential face-threatening properties. In so doing, they define suggestions and advice-giving as actions with which an interlocutor articulates what the recipient 'ought to do'. They classify these actions (along with orders, requests, remindings, threats and warnings) as "acts that predicate some future act" (1987: 313) of the addressee, thereby applying some pressure on the recipient to do the targeted act. Other authors locate suggestions and proposals under the umbrella term *directives* (Couper-Kuhlen & Eelämäki, 2015; Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012; Stevanovic, 2013), alongside other social actions such as requesting and advising, for example.

2.3.2 Suggestions as directives

In the last section, it was explained that suggestion and proposal activity are commonly subsumed under the category of directives. In this section, the structure of directives will be described, as many of their organizational features are encountered in suggestion activity. Introducing phenomena related to directive typology and 'anatomy' provides a frame for understanding the conduct observed in suggestion and proposal sequences.

2.3.2.1 Typology of directives

The typology of directive-related social activity, including proposals and suggestions, can be described as sharing a common base function. According to Goodwin, directives are utterances used "to get someone else to do something." (1990: 65; 2006: 515). They represent a fundamental component within the organization of daily human activity (Goodwin, 2012). Ervin-Tripp, Guo and Lampert (1990) position directives under the category of control-acts, or attempts to produce change in the action of others such as requests, orders and commands. More recently, Couper-Kuhlen and Etlämäki (2015: 7) have described the common feature among all directive actions as being "that through them speakers promote the performance of a putatively desirable or necessary action, in the immediate or remote future, in a way that has consequences for the co-participant's behavior."

Much literature has been dedicated to studying these types of social actions across a variety of disciplines (see for example, Searle, 1976; Ervin-Tripp, 1982; Goodwin, 1990). Research has commonly highlighted the breadth in range of formats and practices used to carry out directives. This category of action is often treated as problematic as it involves the recruitment of another participant's action, thus making directives heard as a potential imposition. Therefore, resources are often used to mitigate the force of the action, such as the use of conditionals, tag questions or hedging, among many others. Furthermore, sequential organization patterns also suggest that directives are dispreferred actions as they are often preceded by some type of elaboration (Schegloff, 2007), so that the turn containing the directive is delayed.

These tendencies shed light on the contextual features of the interaction as well as relationships and identities of the interactants. Formulation of directives is embedded in interaction which requires or supposes distributed agency (Enfield, 2011). Choices of formatting in directive sequences are often linked to orientations to participant status and asymmetry or symmetry in the relationships between interactants.

All of these features of directives make them an interesting object of inquiry. The next section addresses these aspects in more depth in order to strengthen an understanding of how suggestion sequences were used and oriented to in the data analysis of this study.

2.3.2.2 Make-up of directives and influences on them

The architecture of directives, and of the subcategory action of suggestions often comprises multiple turns and sequences that can be described from various perspectives. A directive makes relevant the acceptance or the rejection of the propositional contents of the future action. That is, whether the future action presented will be taken up, or whether it will be ignored, or even negotiated or

expanded further.

The data analyzed this study supports this premise. To give an example, in the following extract, Cristina, one of the dentistry students in a group work meeting, requests Rosa, her peer, to look up the form of an orthodontic term for which they have been searching. Note that the transcription practices follow Jefferson (2004), included in the appendix.

Extract 2-3

1	CRI:	to pro-inclinate
2	ROS:	*sí sí*
		yes yes
3	CRI:	or pro-incline
4	ROS:	pro-in-
5 →	CRI:	uh can you search
		((pointing to computer))
6	ROS:	(inclinate)
7		((moves to search for the word on the computer))
8		((seventeen lines omitted))
9	ROS:	to pro-incline
10		it's correct?
11	CRI:	*sí*
		yes

Cristina's request to Rosa to look up the form of the term, *pro-incline* (line 5) was not only aligned to, in that no negative sanctions for having carried out this action are observable, but also is taken up, as seen by Rosa's compliance. The request is aligned with in that the request turn itself is accepted, and the object of the request is then realized. This extract differs from suggestion sequences shown in the extracts reproduced in Chapter 5, in that the directive (a request) is accepted directly whereas in an extract shown in Chapter 5 with the same students (Extract 5-6), Cristina does not fully align with Laia's directive action (a suggestion). So, directives comprise at least a two-part sequence: the directive formulation and the treatment of the directive's object.

Furthermore, the action presented in the directive for the recipient(s) to do could be for immediate or delayed action (for delayed action in proposals and suggestions see Mandelbaum, 1996; Stevanovic, 2012; Asmuß & Oshima, 2012), the status of which will also play a part in the type of directive and its formulation. The propositional content of the directive—or the action that the interlocutor desires the recipient to do—can therefore be packaged in many formats employing diverse resources over simple or complex sequences. The format's level of complexity can correspond to a degree of directness and/or indirectness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Curl & Drew, 2008; Levinson, 2013).

While such variation also may be attributed to the myriad of goals towards which directives are applied, the literature also points to participant status and asymmetry related to the interactional context as the main phenomena shaping

and constraining the interaction in which these actions are formed. Ervin-Tripp (1976), for example, attributed the diversity in form to relative social rank between interactants, among other elements such as distance, territory, and presence of outsiders. Brown and Levinson (1987) referred to the following sociological variables to be considered in the circumstances of the interaction surrounding such actions: social distance (a symmetric relation), relative power (an asymmetric relation), and absolute ranking of imposition in the particular culture, which represents the "potential expenditure of goods and/or services by the hearer" (Hudsen, Detmer & Brown, 1992). Goodwin refers to the influence of social imposition and social field, or 'status and situation' that using directives implies, (Goodwin, 1990). More recently, Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki (2015) refer to deontic asymmetry that can be revealed in behavior surrounding directives. In such a context, the relative rights related to decisions about the future actions are visible in the speaker's and recipient's conduct.

In taking a CA approach to analyzing phenomena involved in action formation and ascription, the action in question is observed within its emerging context along with the many resources that interactants use in the design of their turns to project this actions, or make them identifiable to co-participants. Conversation analytic studies consider the linguistic as well as the interactional practices deployed in the unfolding sequences in which directives arise. By means of this methodology, and this degree of granularity, interactants' orientations toward status and asymmetry can be revealed.

2.3.3 Requests: 'Cousins' of suggestions

In this section, the structure and organization of requests is discussed. As mentioned above, the directive action of requests has received much attention in CA literature. A brief review of CA literature about this 'cousin' of the suggestion action can bring to light the phenomena affecting and emerging within sequences surrounding these types of actions.

2.3.3.1 Research on requests

Some studies have looked at the different formatting used to make requests (Lindström, 2005; Heinemann, 2006; Curl & Drew, 2008). Variation in turn design is reportedly related to entitlement and imposition. In the analysis of requests, for example, Curl and Drew refer to the "special sensitivity" (2008: 3) that requests invoke as they create a type of imposition on the recipients. These actions can also be seen to display a degree of politeness, or indirectness, depending on the categories or statuses of the interactants involved.

The level of politeness can be indexed in the linguistic forms that make up turn designs, as well as the sequential organization of turns, or the interaction patterns

that lead up to and also follow requests. Speakers' use of linguistic resources displays their understanding of the contingencies linked to the actual requesting outcome. For example, most of the requests in the study by Curl and Drew (2008) comprised modal verbs in questions that addressed recipients' ability or willingness (or both) to grant the request. In fact, studies of interactions in English in general show that requests are mainly formatted in *can, could and would you* questions (Levinson, 2013). However, Curl and Drew's study further showed that requests constructed with *I wonder if* forms were used when the interactants displayed orientations related to the low entitlement, high contingency status of the request's being completed. These studies, therefore, demonstrate a relationship between the linguistic, or lexical-syntactic formulations and participants' orientations towards status, asymmetry, and in turn entitlement and imposition. Other studies have shown similar results in other settings, such as in interaction among elderly residents and their caregivers in nursing homes in Sweden (Lindström, 2005) and in Denmark (Heinemann, 2006).

Of course, conversation analytic methodology does not stop at the utterance level, nor does it consider the linguistic resources deployed in turn design in isolation. Actions are studied within their environments, the unfolding spate of talk within which they arise. The interactional context (the preceding and following turns) is what helps determine whether the action assigned to an utterance using an interrogative format is heard as being a request for information, a request for services, or a rhetorical question, for example. This is particularly relevant when analyzing data taken from interactions carried out in an additional language, such as English is for the speakers in the data in this thesis.

In Extract 2-1 the request is formatted as a question, but Rosa does not display an understanding of Cristina's action as seeking information. At the same time, Rosa does request information in line 10, but formats her turn as a declarative, using a prosodic marker, rising intonation, in the formation of her action. Cristina shows her understanding of Rosa's turn as seeking information with her response in line 11 (*yes*).

In the next extract (Extract 2-2), Cristina uses the interrogative form to formulate her candidate script to start the rehearsal. The other group members understand this *wh*-question to be a rhetorical question as well as a suggested script. In other words, Cristina is neither requesting information from them, nor is she using the rhetorical question as she would in a real presentation context, where her co-participants form part of her audience.

Extract 2-4

```
1    LAI:   so:o (.2)
            ((raises eyebrows looks at Cristina))
2    LAI:   qué?
            what
```

```
3     CRI:   definition
4   →        what are removable appliance
5   →LAI:    we try to do it (.2)
6     ROS:   like a presen↑↓tation
             ((looking at Cristina))
7     CRI:   ((shrugs shoulders))
8            what ( )
             ((looking at Rosa))
9     ROS:   i- it suppose that we a:are
             ((gesturing with hands like typing; raises eyebrows;
             laughing))
10    CRI:   planning
```

In line 5, Laia initiates request information, or a clarification from Cristina, but she formats this request using a declarative grammatical structure. Rosa finishes Laia's turn using prosodic resources to make the collaborative turn recognizable as a declarative question. Cristina responds with an indirect, *what* (line 8), along with her embodied action of shrugging, indicating a somewhat defensive stance towards Rosa's and Laia's questioning of her proposed action.

Extract 2-5 below is taken from data among another 3-member group (Rita, Gabriela and Laura), who are preparing for their oral presentation. Gabriela is rehearsing her part when Rita intervenes to ask a question.

Extract 2-5

```
1 RIT: →    .hhh will you be ↓↑reading?
2 GAB:      no
3 RIT:      the presentation?
4 GAB:      ((shakes head from side to side 'no'))
5 RIT:      okay
6 GAB:      ((looking up))
7           and the:::e↑e
8           the nickel titanium
```

Rita grammatically packages her turn as a polar question (line 1) to Gabriela during her rehearsal. Gabriela responds to the question with an appropriate response type, *no* (line 2), but also indicates with her body position (looking up in line 6) that she understood Rita's action as a type of suggestion, broaching on a request, to modify her oral delivery style. Gabriela is seen to align and affiliate with Rita's 'suggestion' to not read during her rehearsal by complying.

Finally, in Extract 2-6, we see a sequence from a third 3-member group (Alex, Tomás and Oscar) in which a co-participant (Tomás) may actually be requesting or confirming information from the rehearser (Alex) about an item he as just presented.

Extract 2-6

```
1  ALE:     in the second picture you'll see
2           it's not the mandible
3           which is uh changing its growth
4           it's the fossa
5           which is moving anteriorly
6           in order to adapt to the new position
7           of the mandible. (.)
8           .h and
9  TOM:  →  okay so it-
10       →  it isn't the mandible
11          which (.) move
12 ALE:     n-
13 TOM:     it's the:e
14 ALE:     no you yo:ou rotate the mandible eh
15          down and anteriorly¿
16 TOM:     and [(xxx the:e]
17 ALE:         [and then] the fossa remodels
18          in order to adapt to [the] new position.=
19 TOM:                          [okay]
20 ALE:     =so you're not really changing the:[e]
21 TOM:                                       [yeah]
22          the con[dyle]
23 ALE:            [the] growth pattern
24          of the of the:e mandible or the condyle¿
25          you're just u:uh making the fossa (.)
26          adapt to the new position of the mandible.
27 TOM:     okay cool
```

In the extract above, Tomás initiates a request for information in line 9 during Alex's rehearsing. He opens the sequence immediately after Alex has treated the topic on which Tomás focuses his inquiry regarding the growth patterns of the mandible and the fossa. In fact, he takes the floor after Alex has indicated, with a discourse marker, *and* (line 8), that he was not finished with his rehearsing activity. Tomás constructs his turn with a declarative question (lines 9-13) repeating some of the contents from Alex's explication about this topic. This type of action is hearable as seeking confirmation action when the propositional contents of the declarative pertain to the epistemic domain (see section 2.5, below) of the recipient, and also tends to be deployed after the speaker has been told the information addressed (Heritage, 2012b). Tomás uses an *okay* turn initiation device (line 19), indicating a divergence from the ongoing activity, and a *so*-discourse marker (line 20) to connect his next action with the previous activity, or Alex's informing.

Alex displays his understanding of Tomás' action as a request for confirmation with his negative response, *no* (a cut-off *no* in line 12, and a full confirmation in line 14). He expands his confirmation with a further explanation about the source of trouble or confusion (line 14-26). Tomás makes visible his acceptance or understanding of Alex's explanation by overlapping his turn in line 19 with an *okay* token as well as an affirmative *yeah*-token in line 21 which precedes his attempt to complete Alex's turn. Once Alex finishes his extended answer to Tomás' declarative

question, Tomás indicates his acceptance of this explication with an *okay* (line 27) followed by a positive term, *cool*, both showing his agreement and closing of the sequence.

This extract represents one of the rare occasions, within the data of this study, when an interactant was actually requesting information or confirmation about an aspect of the topic that another student had presented. He did not use an interrogative format to do so, but was heard as seeking confirmation as can be seen in his recipient's response.

These data demonstrate how the ascription of an action to a turn is not only dependent on the linguistic elements of turn design itself but is also understood within an interactional context. That is, the data show how contextual features have a bearing on the way that interactants project and also construe each other's actions.

2.3.3.2 Preference in conversation analysis and in requests

As part of the analysis of sequential organization of interaction, CA methodology also considers the concept of *preference*. In her study of assessments, or actions that display the speaker's "claims of knowledge" (1984: 57) about a topic arising in conversation, Pomerantz described preference as the way that a turn is designed so as to elicit, or 'invite' a certain type of response: "A next action that is oriented to as invited will be called a *preferred next action*; its alternative, a *dispreferred next action*" (Pomerantz, 1984: 63-64).

Pomerantz goes on to describe two types of turn shapes: one which "maximizes the occurrence of the action being performed" (1984: 64), or it is a turn design that facilitates the action formation, while the other "minimalizes the occurrence of action being performed" (1984: 64), through the use of resources in the attempt to downplay or even obscure the action. As an example, she describes agreement actions, the generally preferred next action, as being carried out with little time between the initial turn, in this case, an assessment, and the response. In contrast, a disagreement is usually followed by a delay within the next turn or over several turns. Besides organizational considerations in regards to preference, Pomerantz also explicates turns displaying agreement or disagreement in terms of types of resources used and content included in assessment sequences.

It warrants attention, here, that the term *preference* is not used to refer to emotional or psychological motives, but rather to the interactional dimension of an action that is relevant in CA literature. When CA refers to an aspect related to affect displayed in turn design and recipiency, the terms *affiliative* or *disaffiliative* are employed. Stivers (2008; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011) described the difference between structural alignment and social affiliation. Participants can display cooperation by aligning with the previous emerging action, but they can

also show cooperation with the propositional contents of the turn—or the articulated proposed action. By affiliating with speaker, the recipient shows agreement with his or her 'evaluative stance'.

Building on the concept of preference, Schegloff (2007) has further explicated preference organization and applied it to other types of actions. He reviews characteristics and conduct related to the turn design and organizational practices of *responses*, such as mitigation, elaboration, positioning and type conformity among others. In reference to preference organizational aspects of *first pair parts*, or initial anchoring turns and actions on which a course of actions hinge, he reports that there is a preference of offers over requests in actions in turns that are designed to achieve the "transfer of something of value—whether object, service, or information—from one person to another" (2007: 82). To recruit an offer, the interlocutor must sometimes carry out multiple turns to steer the conversation in a way that projects this recruitment goal. For this reason, the location of requests, according to Schegloff (2007), is usually delayed over a stretch of talk and may follow other topics and sequences before it is expressed.

Schegloff refers to such prefatory courses of actions as pre-requests. Pre-requests are designed to elicit an offer from the recipient, which in turn will improve chances of the recipients' ultimate performance of the desired action without reaching a request formation. Such courses of actions may obscure the action which the interlocutor is would like the recipient to carry out. They may also be employed to project an upcoming request. In so doing, pre-requests involve the participation of the recipient in managing the request sequence, thus enabling the pre-emption of the request itself through the recipient's offer or by the redirecting of the sequence away from the request, a dispreferred action.

Particularly interesting for the present study is Schegloff's reference to interactants' practices in constructing requests as "masking of them as other actions" (2007:84). Other devices such as mitigations, accounts, and hesitance among other actions are often used to cushion the effect of the request. In addition to these behaviors, Schegloff reports that a common outcome of opening the interactional space to request sequences is the occurrence of more of these types of actions. This may indicate orientations that an appropriate environment for requests is one where a request has been made visible, and acceptance of this action has been secured, thereby making it a relatively safe space for this type of activity. All of these features (e.g. mitigation markers, masking actions, and prefatory sequences) indicate that requests are treated as problematic.

Other studies of requests have elucidated their interactional status as being a dispreferred activity (Levinson, 1983; Taleghani-Nikasm, 2005; Heinemann, 2006). Requests are commonly constructed in a way to increase the probability of recruiting a preferred response (acceptance or compliance) and impeding the

occurrence of dispreferred responses (Heritage 1984; Lerner 1996; Schegloff 1990, 2007; Taleghani-Nikazm 2006; Huth, 2010). In particular, the use of pre-request sequences has been shown to be a common strategy to either render the foreshadowed dispreferred action to a less imposing status, or to avoid reaching it at all. This is done by means of either the recipient's offer to perform the targeted action or of a display of unwillingness or inability to grant the request before it is even formulated. Such interactional practices encourage cooperative and affiliative actions (Heritage, 1984; Clayman, 2002).

While request sequences have been shown to be treated as problematic, they constitute a ubiquitously occurring action in social activity. Some research (Lindström, 2005; Heinemann, 2006; Curl & Drew, 2008) has studied data from social contexts, mainly institutional settings, where requests can be normatively expected or used. As mentioned above (see section 2.4.3.1), these studies have analyzed the choice of request formats in association with interactants' orientations towards entitlement and potential contingencies surrounding the action requested. In these studies, the linguistic packaging displayed the requestor's stance towards their degree of entitlement to make a request of a certain recipient for certain actions. Furthermore, the interlocutor showed an understanding towards the grantability (Curl & Drew, 2008) of the request being dependent on circumstances surrounding the action. For example, speakers may display a lack of entitlement when constructing requests by projecting uncertainty regarding whether an institutional policy allows for their requests to be fulfilled or not.

2.3.3.3 Status in request sequences

The term *entitlement* indicates a type of *status*, where participants orient to the possession or lack of certain rights related to their position in the interactional and exogenous context. As mentioned above, orientations to the right or lack of entitlement to make a request can be seen in the formatting of the request. *Stances,* or turn by turn orientations towards the interlocutor's entitlement to do so, can also be seen in the recipient's actions.

Status is an underlying element that relativizes organizational phenomena (Enfield, 2011). It shapes and is shaped by such phenomena as those outlined above: prefatory sequences, masking actions, mitigation, preference and displayed stances towards entitlement. In CA literature, concepts of status and related social identities among participants in interaction were initially addressed by Sacks (1992; 1965) as membership categories. Social identities, then, are the ways that interactants orient towards and project "membership of some feature-rich category" (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998: 2). From a CA perspective, identity is emerging and locally constructed (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

Orientations toward status are what shape, constrain or modulate the unfolding utterances and embodied action over the course of talk in interaction. There can be different types and layers of status at play in any interaction. There are normatively assigned statuses related to exogenous social positions such as doctor-patient, teacher-student or parent-child. Status, however, from a CA perspective, is a fluid or non-stable element that can emerge and be re-edified from turn to turn. This type of status is situated and negotiated in interaction. This locally assigned status can be, for example, questioner—answerer, greeter—greetee, suggester—suggestee, etc.

As seen in the data presented above (specifically Extracts 2-1 and 2-3), the recipients display alignment to the interlocutor's status, or rights to initiate directive actions, in that they stop their rehearsing activity to give them the floor. Co-participants can also show varying degrees of commitment to the action requested or proposed. They can do so by carrying out such actions as taking up the suggestion or complying to the request, as seen in Extract 2-1 and 2-3, rather than simply acknowledging the directive or negotiating the execution of the action articulated in the directive. This will be seen in data shown in Chapter 5.

Displays of entitlement can also be seen within the management of the sequences shown in Extracts 2-1 and 2-3. As mentioned in section 2.4.2.1, directives are usually treated as problematic, and therefore leading to indirect or more complex interaction patterns. Initiating a directive sequence may comprise several turns before reaching the appearance of the directive, and it also may lead to a more complex post-expansion of this sequence. Throughout these courses of action, orientations toward entitlement shape and constrain the emerging interaction.

In the data of this study, the level of entitlement is an omni-relevant feature to which interactants orient, and displays of these stances permeate all levels of interaction, particularly in the organization and design of directive projects. But on what do these stances towards entitlement hinge? The participants interacting in the meeting occasions to prepare for their oral presentations were, on an institutional level, considered peers. They were all fourth-year students and were all responsible for one, jointly shared pedagogical project. Yet decisions needed to be made regarding the development of this presentation task.

Decision-making needs were usually addressed by means of suggestion sequences. If suggestions, a form of directive, are treated as problematic and also orient to entitlement to make them and expect them to be carried out, how can decisions ultimately be reached? How is cooperation enlisted so that the progressivity of the overall tasks (rehearsal and co-constructing a whole presentation) is maintained? The following research will contribute to answering these questions.

2.3.4 Research in suggestions and proposals

This section returns the focus specifically to suggestion and proposal activity. A brief literature review of suggestions and proposals in CA research is provided to explicate the structure and organization of such sequences, which includes the status-related phenomena.

2.3.4.1 Structure and organization

Literature focusing solely on proposals and suggestions is in alignment with all of the concepts related to directives and requests discussed above. As regards action formation, the variety of formatting related to mitigation has also been reported, such as the use of modals or interrogatives, which render suggestions and proposals a weakened form of a directive (Meier, 2002; Tykkyläinen & Laakso, 2009) and of advice (Li, 2009). On the continuum of imposition that directives may represent, suggestions carry less force than a request, and are formulated to display an orientation to the proposed action as one option among others (Mandelbaum, 1996.)

The interactional participant acting as a suggester or proposer commonly prepares the ground for this problematic action with pre-proposals, or even pre-pre-sequences (Schegloff, 1980; 2007; Houtkoop-Steensra, 1990). Houtkoop-Steensra (1990) describes this pre-elaboration comprising a projection of the action to come, drawing attention to a type of trouble, and finally articulating the proposal. She states that such a process has a dual function: to serve as an introduction for the proposal but also to indicate that this action will be delicate. She also shows, in her study, that accounts are another resource used to mitigate proposal and request actions, and the location of these accounts (before or after the request or proposal turn) indicates the speakers' stance regarding the degree of imposition.

Mandelbaum (1996) referred to unilateral versus collaborative proposals, which were more indirect forms of this action. Whereas a unilateral suggestion was more normatively recognized as a suggestion, a collaborative proposal enlisted the cooperation of suggestee to negotiate the future action. She referred to these practices as "methods for performing conjoint actions" (1996: 152).

These understandings of suggestions and proposals are in line with Enfield's (2011) notion of distributed agency. Suggestions and proposals are also actions that require an action from different agents. The construction of suggestion sequences will always take into account the participants who execute the action, the those who plans how the action will be performed, and agents who commit to the action and takes responsibility for it. Stevanovic (2013, 2012) contextualizes this concept in her study about proposals in joint-decision making settings. She states that proposals are especially prevalent in social activities that comprise the

organizing of future plans together. She further explains that this type of social activity "involves strong normative expectations that it should be *more than one* participant who has a word to say on the decisions to be made" (2013, p. 520).

Nevertheless, at the same time that participants display stances towards joint decision-making, Stevanovic (2012) suggests that the actual initiating of a proposal may be problematic in that doing so can also represent an imposition; this is an action to which the recipient is expected to align.

2.3.4.2 Status in suggestion and proposal sequences

Research has also shown the influence of status and symmetry/asymmetry in the formation of proposal and suggestion actions (Mandelbaum, 1996; Asmuß & Oshima, 2012; Stevanovic, 2012; 2013). According to Mandelbaum, the different types of ways that interactants formulate or package their suggestions displayed their orientations to the relative roles among interactants.

Findings in Asmuß and Oshima's work showed that participants, who occupied asymmetrical statues in a work setting, oriented to entitlement in the launching, acceptance and rejection of proposals; the researchers observed the fluidity of the institutional roles within the alignment and affiliating sequences within the interactional context, further demonstrating that status in interaction is not a stable element.

Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2012), in their study of doing proposals, suggested that the contingency of the recipients' acceptance or approval of a proposal might suggest more symmetric distribution of rights and entitlement among interactants engaged in proposal activity than in those engaged in request interactions. They, however, emphasized that that participants in their data also displayed stances towards asymmetric status when formulating proposals.

2.4 Epistemic status

One major domain in the study of status in CA is related to epistemics. Research in this area focuses on how interactants display their knowledge throughout sequences of interaction. Being able to determine the knowledge and type of knowledge that is either shared with or different from that of a co-participant is essential for humans to be able to refer to any object addressed in a conversation (Heritage, 2013). Much research in CA has analyzed how interactants index their orientations toward each other's *epistemic status*, which is linked to their *epistemic domains*. Kamio (1997) developed the construct, *territories of knowledge*, in his research about how participants index the relationship between their status of knowledge and a domain of information. He depicted this relationship as being locatable on a scale from 0 (highly distant) to 1 (closest possible, which also indicates a type of ownership of the information.) In addition to providing a model

to describe the character of such epistemic relationships in terms of proximity to and possession of the domain of information, Kamio also put forth the notion of entitlement, or having the right to know something and to articulate it—a status that was not always dependent on the access each interactant had to the epistemic domain.

Other researchers have continued this line of research into epistemic status with a focus on orientations to the rights associated with ownership of epistemic domains as well as the associated responsibilities and obligations that these relationships can be imply (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011). Furthermore, researchers have shown how the epistemic stances displayed in interaction are essential to the shaping and development of identities relative to the co-participants (Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Heritage, 2013).

When analyzing interaction through an epistemic lens, the difference between the terms status and stance must be highlighted. Theorists in this area (Heritage, 2010, 2012; Heritage & Raymond, 2012; Heritage, 2013) have referred to epistemic status as the relative access that an individual has to an epistemic domain. A participant with epistemic primacy, for example, occupies a more knowledgeable status (K+), while others occupy a lesser knowledgeable status (K-). This difference can be depicted by degrees of slope—shallower and deeper depending on the varying and relative levels of access. An asymmetrical status arises from the collective recognition of the positioning according to knowledgeable status. Epistemic stance is an interactants' turn-by-turn display of their orientations to or understandings of the emerging epistemic status. Attitudes related to epistemic status are indexed and managed by resources recognized by CA as deployed in turn design and sequence organization to negotiate epistemic priority and subordination.

A classic example of displaying deference to another's epistemic priority in an interlocutor's turn design might be the use of information requests, with an interrogative format and a rising intonation (Heritage, 2013a). In another study by Heritage (2013b), he demonstrated the influence of the position of a turn in a course of actions in the interactants' display of stances towards epistemic authority. According to Heritage, the actual initiation of a sequence may convey a certain epistemic status. If, for example, the initiator of the sequence occupies a less knowledgeable (K-) status, she or he may downgrade her or his claim with the use of a polar interrogative. In contrast, recipients with a higher knowing (K+) status might exhibit behavior to indicate their status, such as the use of an *oh*-prefaced turn (Heritage, 1998).

Such displays are related to a drive to achieve epistemic congruence within an interaction. Congruence between epistemic status and stance refers to the alignment between these phenomena (status and stance), and research has shown that the management of these epistemic domains and the boundaries around these territories of information are rigorously monitored and guarded (Heritage, 2012a, 2013). This would not seem surprising if such territories are seen to be related to the emergence of identities within interaction as Raymond and Heritage (2006) have reported. According to Heritage (2012a) orientations in pursuing and maintaining epistemic congruence is one element that can drive the interaction as participants address the asymmetry in the knowing and unknowing statuses.

Attention to interaction directed at changes and changing epistemic statuses reveals another feature of epistemic status: its fluidity. Epistemic status and stances are not stable throughout social activity. Even within institutional settings where pre-established identities and relationships may exist, stances toward such epistemic positioning change over epistemic domains as well as over emergent turn-by-turn interactional contexts.

Stances toward epistemic status, access, obligations and rights were displayed in the data of this study. This dimension of the participants' interaction was an element that shaped, constrained and propelled progressivity of the activities in this context. The suggestion sequences emerging in over the meeting occasions were initiated, managed and closed by interactants with differing and changing epistemic statuses.

2.5 Summary

This chapter has presented notions and concepts that are key to the analyses presented in Chapters 4 through 10. Interpretations of the data are informed by a socio-interactional perspective of learning and a CA approach to social interaction. Research related to CA literature regarding suggestion sequences, a recurring interactional pattern in the data of the present study, has served to present structural and interactional phenomena associated with this type of action, such as preference, prefatory conduct and also epistemic status. Socio-interactional theory has been discussed to highlight the complementary nature of the relationship between socio-cultural and CA perspectives. Within the socio-interactional framework, the notion of scaffolding has been explained, which is central to this study as such behaviors emerge within suggestion sequences, as will be presented in Chapter 6.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This study comprises a conversation analysis of the interaction among fourth-year dental students as they collaborate in small groups to prepare for an oral presentation assigned as part of their university course work. Their teacher was also the author of this thesis. Video data were collected over three years with three different student cohorts, two of which provided the data for analysis in the current study. The data of three small groups were ultimately selected for in-depth transcription and analysis with the aim to discover and describe the types of activities, actions and practices accomplished by the participants in achieving an academic task.

The structure of this chapter will be the following. The general research context, the participants and the institutionally assigned learning task will be described in the first three sections (3.2 – 3.4). Following this contextualization of the study, the data collection, and the analytical and data selection processes will be outlined in sections 3.5 through 3.7. Finally, in section 3.8, a summary of this chapter will be given.

3.2 Research context

This section provides a description of the context in which the research is situated. A background of the educational situation is first presented to provide a more global view of the local learning culture. The development of the ICLHE program is then described in order to contextualize the type of activity in which the participants shown in the data were engaged.

3.2.1 The University setting

The research setting of this study was the Dental School belonging to a private, Catalan university. The dental program is located in the university's Health Sciences campus, which is located in a town in the area surrounding the capital city, Barcelona. The undergraduate Degree in Dentistry consists of a five-year program, which was initiated at the same time the university first opened its doors, in 1997. Its curriculum was originally designed to incorporate an Evidence-Based approach to dentistry as an overlying framework for courses and clinical training. Such an approach is based on the ability to access and appraise the best research in order to answer questions that arise in a clinical context. The vast

majority of Health Sciences research is published in English, which also tends to be the lingua franca of international Health Sciences conferences and professional and academic exchanges. Therefore, the designers of the dental program decided to include a strong presence of instruction in the English language in the curriculum.

3.2.2 The ICLHE program

In the plan put together in the 1990s, the dental students originally completed one hundred and twenty hours of English in their first years in the form of three courses, one per trimester (English for Dentistry 1, 2 and 3.) They also were to take a sixty-hour English course in both their fourth and fifth years. After the initiation of the Bologna process a couple of decades later, the number of hours dedicated to these English classes dropped to sixty hours in year one, forty-five in year two and sixty in year five. However, these classes continue to hold a strong presence in these students' educational experience. Furthermore, the amount of content being taught in English is increasing as more dentistry professors adopt an EMI, or sometimes ICHLE, approach to teaching.

The designers of the English courses — the author of this thesis being a co-creator in their development — originally adopted an English for Specific and Academic Purposes (ESP) methodology in the development of health sciences programs. These programs soon evolved to become grounded in an ICLHE methodology, with a thematic focus on quantitative methodological concepts applied in recent discipline-related research. Competence in disciplinary discourse and literacy was to be fomented by means of guided analyses and oral presentations of research in current topics of the profession. A general objective of these types of courses included increasing efficiency in reading comprehension of actual dental research published in current professional journals and presenting related content in group oral presentations.

The classes were normally formed by grouping students according to their levels of the English language, as determined by placement exams given in students' first year at university. Depending on the year, this process resulted in three to four groups per subject. Though the content, main assignments and evaluation remained the same for each class, teaching methodology was expected to take into account the language level of the class; thus, some teaching practices may have varied depending on students' abilities.

Throughout the years, the ICLHE courses were designed for collaboration with some of the other subjects included in the curriculum. For example, students in the English for Dentistry 3 course (D3) originally worked on projects that were assigned and evaluated by the language teachers and the content professors of the Restorative Dentistry course. The English for Dentistry 2 course (D2) was designed

to parallel the students' Orthodontics 3 course—as it does to this day. The Orthodontics 3 course was the first endeavor of the dental school to introduce an EMI course. Some of the lectures in this course are delivered in English. It was thought at the time that the students would need support in order to follow the course successfully. Therefore, the content for the ICLHE D2 course was based on research in orthodontics.

As a result, a main project assigned in the D2 course was an oral presentation based on a lecture from the Orthodontics 3 subject. The students worked together in groups to summarize the lecture content, and present it in English. This task comprised the students' meeting together to plan, organize and rehearse the presentation prior to their performance.

Currently, the students of the Dental School are receiving increasingly more content in an EMI context. The students are expected to carry out minor research projects testing dental restorative materials and are encouraged to publish their findings. The other courses in the curriculum are also assigning more oral presentations as well as more reading of the literature in their field to analyze and summarize results of relevant research. Hence, there is visible coherence in the global academic culture and expectations of this institution. In other words, the approach and objectives outlined in the ICLHE courses are in line with those that the students encounter in their other content courses.

3.3 Participants and setting

As has been mentioned, this is a study of the interaction among fourth-year dental students in a multilingual university setting. The participants are students from the D2 course, which takes an ICLHE approach to teaching and to students' learning of their third language, English. This subject, taught in the first semester of the students' fourth year, was the second of three ICLHE course taught in the dental program. The students had, therefore, been exposed to the general methodology of this type of course. Furthermore, many of the students had had the researcher, their teacher, as a teacher in their first year course (D1).

The students who participated in the study were mostly local, with some originating from other regions of Spain and also other countries of Europe. They were attending the class that represented the highest level of English, even though among this group there was a fairly broad range of competences in this language.

Data were collected in three different years with three different student cohorts. The data from three groups from two different years were ultimately selected for in-depth analysis. The participants in the first group, comprising three students with varying linguistic competences in the English language, were Rosa, Laia and

Cristina, the names of whom have been changed to ensure anonymity for this study. These students attended the D2 class in the 2013-14 academic year. The data include their participation in one meeting (15.20 minutes) prior to their oral presentation in class.

The two other groups (also with three members each) participated in the 2015-2016 academic year. The group members included Rita, Laura and Gabriela in one group, and Alex, Tomás and Oscar in the other. Rita, Laura and Gabriela provided recordings for two of their meetings (see explanation of the project in section 3.4 and of data collection procedures in 3.5). One meeting (14:22 minutes) was held before they developed their PowerPoint presentation and one (33:21 minutes) after its completion. Alex, Tomás and Oscar' recorded two online meetings as well, but the majority of their first meeting was lost due to technical problems (0:48 seconds). The length of their second meeting, in which they rehearsed their presentation, was 36:06 minutes.

3.4 The assigned project: an oral presentation

The data for this study, therefore, comprise recordings of the dental students working together outside of class as part of their preparation for their upcoming oral presentation. While the students had been instructed that the recording of their meeting represented a part of the oral presentation assignment instructions, they were also aware of the data would be used for research purposes as well.

At the beginning of the D2 course, the students formed groups of two, three or four in a few cases, to carry out an oral presentation project together. The oral presentation project comprised several components. The ultimate goal of this assignment involved presenting a summary of a lecture from their Orthodontics 3 course, which they had theoretically attended within the previous week.

One oral presentation was given at the beginning of each D2 class. The students were expected to speak for at least twenty minutes and also handle questions from the audience after their presentation. The audience was instructed to take notes during the presentation, as this content was to be recycled and assessed in later assignments during the course.

The group's summary was to be delivered in English in front of an audience of the presenters' peers and the class teacher, who would evaluate their performance. The students were to be assessed on their ability to competently demonstrate their knowledge of the topic as well as their use of related professional and academic discourse in English. Competence in this setting was defined in terms of accuracy of content explained, appropriate disciplinary discourse in an additional language, organizational coherence and effective delivery of their material.

The main objective of the overall assignment was to prepare the students to be able to present research in professional settings, such as international conferences or research project meetings. Another objective was to provide reinforcement of the content for which the students were responsible in their Orthodontics 3 course. In other words, the presenters were to help teach an area of content related to their Orthodontics 3 course.

The student audience generally had access to this area of knowledge by means of the orthodontic lecture delivered to the entire cohort previously. Therefore, the novelty of the students' presentation for the audience was mainly linguistic: the introduction of the content in an additional language rather than in their first languages. This aspect of the assignment underscored one of the overall objectives of all of the students' ICLHE courses, which was to display abilities in learning to learn in their third language (L3).

Modeling of an oral presentation was done in class by the teacher, who was also the researcher, and peer assessment concepts and practices were introduced prior to the first oral presentation. Descriptors for 'good' presentations versus 'poor' presentations were collectively developed, and the instructor explained her own general expectations of the presentations.

Evaluation criteria of the task were explicitly discussed in class and made available to the students on their Moodle platform, which is a university-wide virtual learning environment to which all students and teachers have access. The criteria were based on the students' delivery (e.g. volume, dynamics, body language, eye contact with the audience, etc.); the students' handling of the content (e.g. depth of knowledge and accuracy thereof, organization and coherence in the explanations of the content); the students' accuracy of the content-specific language as well as its pronunciation, and appropriateness of professional discourse; and the students' PowerPoint presentation (e.g. use of text; images; and readability). These criteria had been applied in the students' previous ICLHE Dentistry 1 class, in which they had given two oral presentations, but on other topics.

Student meetings, held to prepare for the presentation, constituted a component of this group project. The students were instructed to record the meetings, and send the recording to their teacher before the date of their oral presentations. The purpose of this recording was originally to ensure participation and coherence among the students towards the development of their work. It also served as a resource for the teacher towards formative assessment of the students and as a diagnostic tool in detecting individual learning needs.

Instructions for the meeting procedures were fairly open-ended in that the students were explicitly told to do the recording wherever they wanted, for whatever length they felt was adequate, and to some degree, however they interpreted the task. The original assignment of the meeting component of the project only required students to record, or attend, one session prior to the oral presentation. They were to use this meeting time to rehearse and prepare for their presentation. This assignment later developed into two meetings (see Section 3.7). The objective of the first one was to plan for their presentation by deciding on what content to cover (for a summary of a 2-hour orthodontics lecture), creating an outline of the overall presentation structure and also assigning parts to each group member, who would then be responsible for developing the associated script and PowerPoint slides. The second meeting was then for rehearsal and editing purposes.

The videos further provided a window for the teacher into the abilities, attitudes and practices of the students' handling of academic and professional discourse related to their field as well as into the complex interaction that collaborative work implies. These videos later became a rich resource for carrying out systematic practitioner research, resulting in this thesis.

3.5 Data collection

As has been explained, the data for this study were provided by the videos recorded during the students' meetings. The students were informed of the research study and invited to participate. The data collection for the study itself did not demand extra efforts on the part of the students as it constituted part of their regular course load. All of the students displayed interest in participating, and they all signed consent forms approved by the university, allowing their video data to be included in the study.

As mentioned in previous sections, the video data were gathered in three different cohorts of students, two of which provided the data for analysis in the current study. In the interest of obtaining data that might represent the most natural interaction among the students as well as display the students' interpretations of the task, minimal instructions for the recording were outlined. During class, the teacher explained that the students were to record their meetings during which they were to "prepare and rehearse" their presentations. A space with a video camera was offered, but the students were encouraged to carry out this part of the task in the manner they preferred.

At least one video of the students' meetings was collected each week. As a result of such open instructions, much variation was observed across the data. Videos of different durations—between one minute to over forty-five minutes (see Tables 1

in Section 3.5.1 and Table 2 in 3.5.2)—, videos recorded with a variety of devices (such as video cameras, mobile phones and computers), and in a range of settings (in homes, out of doors, in hallways and even online), formed part of the data collected.

Furthermore, there was striking diversity among the students' interpretations of the tasks at hand during the meetings. Given the relative non-confining nature of the instructions for the meeting task, the type of activity the students engaged in, the settings, and participation patterns observed across the data varied greatly.

3.5.1 Data collection of the first two cohorts

Data collected from the first two cohorts included one video per group. Some of these groups recorded their peer-to-peer discussions about what they believed should be explained in their presentation. In other groups' recordings, they included the teacher in the conversation when discussing their plans. That is, they greeted the teacher and presented (to the camera) what they intended to cover in their future presentation. These groups had interpreted the assignment as recording their organizational interaction of the presentation prior to its actual development. One group captured this type of activity in a brief and humorous movie trailer format, which theatrically depicted the students' distribution of the work and criticism of each other's contributions.

Some groups recorded their meetings after having distributed the work and having prepared a PowerPoint presentation. For this type of recorded group work, some students simply provided a demonstration of their rehearsal, and thus only included the delivery of their presentation in the recording without any interruptions.

Other groups in this 'post-PowerPoint development' category recorded rehearsing as well other types of participation that emerged throughout their practicing. These recordings showed the students' rehearsing and also proposing changes to the text or script, correcting mispronounced words, and problem-solving projects among other types of interactions.

One group recorded both a meeting during which the participants developed their PowerPoint presentation together, and another a meeting during which they rehearsed this same presentation. Table 1 below shows the distribution of groups and types of activity seen in the recordings that were collected for the first 2 cohorts.

Table 1. Data collection of the first 2 cohorts
Types of activity observed, number of groups and total number of minutes of video footage.

Pre-PowerPoint Presentation development						**Development of PowerPoint Presentation**		**Post-PowerPoint Presentation development**			
Peer to Peer discussions about future presentation		Presentation about what will be included in the future presentation		"Movie Trailer"		Peer-to-peer co-construction of a PowerPoint presentation		Rehearsal only		Rehearsal & Editing activity	
No. of Groups	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**
5	28	3	9.1	1	1	1	46.50	2	7.2	2	23.6

Based on the analyses of these data (see 3.6) it was decided to modify the video recording component of the project assignment. More naturally occurring interaction emerged in those recorded meetings during which the students worked together with their PowerPoint presentations. Video footage of these types of activities were also longer than other video contents showing other activities.

3.5.2 Data collection of the third cohort

Observations noted in the data of the first two cohorts, regarding duration and type of interaction seen in the recordings led the teacher/researcher to change the oral presentation project. This change also modified the data collection procedures. Consequently, the students in the third year of data collection were instructed to record two meetings, rather than one, prior to their classroom presentation (see Section 3.7). The students were to record themselves planning their presentation before developing their PowerPoint presentation and again after they had developed it. In the second meeting, they were advised to rehearse and prepare their oral presentation.

Not all students handed in two videos. More data were collected for some groups due to the increase in videos required for the assignment. However, the same types of categories of group work activity could be observed in the videos that were collected (see Table 2), with the exception of the movie trailer and the co-construction of the collective PowerPoint presentation seen in earlier data.

Table 2. Data collection of the third cohort **Types of activity observed, number of groups total number of minutes of video footage.**							
Pre-PowerPoint Presentation development				**Post-PowerPoint Presentation development**			
Peer to Peer discussions about future presentation		Presentation about what will be included in the future presentation		Rehearsal only		Rehearsal and editing activity	
No. of Groups	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**	**No. of Groups**	**Total Minutes**
2	14.7	2	7.8	7	97.6	2	69.3

3.5.3 Physical environments of data recordings

As mentioned in Section 3.5, the students were told that they could record their meetings at any location of their choice. This option led to a great diversity of recording sites among the groups. Diversity in the physical settings of the three groups whose data were eventually selected for analysis (see Section 3.7) was also seen. One group recorded their meetings online (Alex, Tomás and Oscar) and did so from their respective homes. The other two groups held and recorded their meetings in spaces provided by the university. Rosa, Laia and Cristina recorded their interaction in the computer room of the university using a video camera. They sat in a row sat at a table with a computer placed in front of Laia (seated in the middle) and one in front of Rosa. Laura, Rita and Gabriela recorded their two meetings in a meeting room in the Language department. They used a mobile telephone as a recording device, and also made use of the white board in the room in some of their interactions.

3.6 Data treatment and initial analyses

An exploratory examination of the data collected in the first year was carried out taking an unmotivated looking approach (Psathas, 1990; Schegloff, 1996) to search for recurring participation patterns. In this initial, case-by case analysis of all the data at a coarser level of granularity, it was found that the most 'natural' seeming or unplanned interactions arose in meetings during unstructured, exploratory and organizational activities, and also during editing sequences that arose throughout rehearsing activities.

The data of these group meetings were transcribed according to common conversation analytic methodology and based on the Jefferson system of transcription notation (Jefferson, 2004; Hepburn & Bolden, 2013). This system was developed to annotate not only the content of utterances, but also to capture the methods that speakers use to build and display meaning. Therefore, symbols indicating such interactional resources, such as volume, breath intakes, laughter or

even length of pauses are included in CA transcripts. The transcription of the data for the present study takes into account certain aspects of embodied conduct, as well as the use of plurilingual aspects of interaction. For example, gaze and hand gestures are included in the transcription of the participants' interaction. In sequences where code-switching arises, the language change is annotated by transcribing the utterance in italics, and providing a translation in English below the transcription line of the turn.

Given the difficulties of transcribing plurilingual speech, as discussed by Nussbaum (2006), the decision was made not to distinguish using different typographic markings (e.g. italics vs. bold) between students' use of Catalan and Spanish, as attempts to do so in initial versions of the transcriptions proved problematic. Orthographic distinction, however, has been made, with decisions to use Catalan or Spanish spelling of similar words being based on students' pronunciation and the researcher's knowledge of their usual communication habits, to avoid phonological transcription. The transcription key is included in the appendix to this thesis.

Within these more spontaneous interactions, types of actions were defined and categorized from an emic perspective, or from the interactants' perspective, according to their stances displayed by their conduct. Conversation analysis takes an emic perspective to identifying emerging actions observed in data. This practice contrasts with research that takes an etic perspective, which is that of the researcher's based on a priori categorization of behavior and attitudes. After a global analysis of interactional contexts and courses of action, repetitive cycles of sequences (ten Have, 1999) were earmarked and stored for further analysis at a later time, when all the data for that first year had been gathered.

3.7 Data selection and focused analyses

Among the data collected from the first two cohorts, one video comprising a group of three young women provided data that stood out among the others. Particularly salient features of the interaction seen in this video were related to the complexity and naturalness of the talk, as well as the length of the recording (over fifteen minutes of interaction) compared to the rest of the videos. Over the course of their recorded meeting, the group members, Rosa, Laia and Cristina, engaged in organizational activity during which they negotiated their meeting's objective and procedures. They also rehearsed their presentation, throughout which emerged sequences of their editing and co-creating the scripts and PowerPoint texts of their presentation. No other video provided nearly that amount of data or included such variety in types of activities, which in turn gave rise to different types of participation patterns.

Another object of interest in this video was the marked and varying differences in levels of the students' third language. One of the interactants' levels was noticeably lower, yet she was able to interact competently and contribute effectively in the execution of the participants' shared academic task. For all of these reasons, this video, a particularly interesting case, was selected as the starting point for a full and in-depth analysis of this group's interaction.

A micro-analysis of the data from this group was then carried out. This analysis afforded the identification and characterization of the various sequences and actions (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997) as well as the moves forming the overall structural organizations (Schegloff, 2007; Robinson, 2013) seen in the unfolding projects of this meeting event.

It was this phase of the analysis that gave rise to a noticing regarding the behavior of sequences categorized as carrying out the main job of doing suggestions or proposals—particularly those initiated by a co-participant for a modification of another's presentation part. These sequences were clearly bounded by openings and closings, as they tended to appear within, around and in response to items being presented during the rehearsing activity. These actions, a type of directive that was discussed in Chapter 2, were treated as problematic or as delicates by the participants, often leading to more complex language and interactional conduct and sometimes resulting in problem-solving activity. The suggestion sequences acted as bridges that facilitated movements between the rehearsing and co-constructing activities.

Each of these sequences was identified and then analyzed by studying the interactants' turn design, or the contents of the propositional contents and the lexical and morphosyntactic resources used to package the participants' formulations. The sequential organization of these sequences was also analyzed to study the moves and locations of certain practices within the stretches of talk. For example, various examples of pre-sequence moves were encountered before the actual suggestion turn was formulated.

Once the architecture of these sequences was examined and documented, an analysis of the way that the participants displayed their orientations towards identity in this context was initiated (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; ten Have, 1999). The actions of the participants were re-visited to explore how they referred to themselves and others regarding the task at hand as well as to the distribution of responsibility of the project. Turn designs were analyzed to search for the interactants' displayed orientations towards the rights and obligations belonging to emerging identities over the accomplishment of shared goals.

Of particular interest was the interactants' resources used to initiate these sequences and package their formulations while negotiating and resolving the sources of trouble that were identified. Within this institutional setting, the students' normatively structured roles were as peers, in terms of equality of access to the information they were responsible for presenting. Therefore, in theory, as co-presenters, they had equal status in producing the presentation product (script for the PowerPoint presentation slides) and also similar access to the lecture's content and course materials, which constituted the sources of the information they were to present.

Nevertheless, an analysis of how the interactants packaged their turns revealed certain patterns in their stances towards each other's levels of entitlement, obligations and expectations (ten Have, 1999) in making bids for the floor to initiate these sequences, as well as the management and final closing of them. The phenomena that seemed to influence the formation of the actions within these projects were related to the students' epistemic statuses and stances (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012a; 2012b; 2013). Drawing from theory and research in epistemics, patterns related to the participants' orientations towards epistemic status, access, obligations and rights were further examined.

Once all the sequences anchored in suggestions and proposal behavior were studied and documented for epistemic phenomena-related participation patterns, the findings from this stage of the analysis informed the analysis of other videos that showed similar types of activity (e.g. rehearsing and co-constructing the group presentation). Apart from the video of this three-member group, very little usable data was available. Only two other videos yielded a few sequences that were analyzable within such a framework and for these interactional phenomena. In one case, a group had recorded two of their meetings. One was a meeting during which the participants created their PowerPoint presentation together. The footage of this meeting was 46.50 minutes in duration. The second meeting (lasting 5.34 minutes) was of their rehearsal. Few suggestion sequences emerged in their interactions, so their data was not included in the study. Nevertheless, observing these students' interpretation of the meeting component of the project and the resulting interactions led to a decision to modify the instructions of this assignment.

After the second year of the research process, as has been mentioned already, it was decided to introduce a change in the video recording component of the oral presentation project. The students in later years were asked to record two meetings: one in which they planned for their presentation, prior to developing the PowerPoint presentation, and one during which they practiced and revised their presentation before they were to deliver their classroom presentation. The openness of the instructions was maintained in terms of the overall instructions, but

each group supplied two videos rather than one. However the meeting themes were somewhat constrained due to the timing of the recordings in the process of carrying out the group project. The first meeting was to be held after the assigned lecture (the topic of their presentation) and before the development on the PowerPoint slides. This meant that the topics of this meeting would most likely relate to organizing the project, such as the PowerPoint contents and labor division. The second meeting was to be carried out after the PowerPoint slides were developed. The editing and practicing of this work then constituted the main object of their attention during this meeting.

This change afforded much longer videos and also more candid interactions among the group members in general. However, only two other groups provided videos that included data showing participants engaged in both rehearsal and suggestion activities. Like the first video that was selected for analysis, each of these two groups comprised three members. One group (Rita, Laura and Gabriela's) provided two full videos. Their pre-presentation video, which included rehearsal time of their presentation, was over thirty-three minutes long. Their first video (over fourteen minutes), which showed their planning of the topic and assignment of parts, also yielded rich data that was used in the present study.

Another group's (Alex, Tomás and Oscar) pre-presentation video lasted a little over thirty-six minutes. This group's interaction was recorded online. Due to some technological problems, some of their video recording froze, so a large portion of it only captured their audio interaction. This type of problem also resulted in the loss of the data from their first video, of which only forty-eight seconds of video footage was salvaged.

The videos of these three groups, then, supplied the data for the present study's analysis of the phenomena discussed above: interaction emerging within suggestion and proposal sequences and the contextual features related to epistemic status, access, obligations and entitlement on the shaping and constraints of these courses of action. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapters 4 and 5. These findings attempt to answer the research questions (see Chapter 1, Section 1.11) regarding how students interpret the activity in which they are engaged (Chapter 4) and in what type of emerging and recurring activities the students engage over the course of their meetings (Chapter 5).

After completing this primary analysis of suggestion and proposal sequences, the study turned to a focus on a specific types of learning behaviors emerging within these data. Scaffolding practices had been seen in the data analyzed in the first group (Rosa, Laia and Cristina) but had not been systematically explored. Drawing from scaffolding descriptors by Wood et al. (1976) and by Tharp and Gallimore (1988), all of the suggestion sequences were re-analyzed to identify scaffolding-

related conduct. This second analysis is reported in Chapter 6 and aims to answer a different set of research questions, as formulated in Chapter 1, Section 1.11, relating to the learning opportunities afforded by a setting in which the teacher is not physically present.

3.8 Summary

This section has outlined the data collection and analytical processes of the present study. True to CA perspectives, the process itself can be characterized as emerging and reciprocal in that 1. the initial analysis of the data was completed from an unmotivated looking approach. That is, observation practices and identification of phenomena unfolded after the data was collected rather than according to previously defined categorizations of expected behavior in the learning task.

Furthermore, based on the findings of initial analyses, as well as on participant interpretations of the assigned meeting tasks, the learning situation itself was modified by the practitioner/ researcher to richen and vary the type of space in which the students could interact. Students were asked to hold and record two meetings, rather than the one that had previously been required in earlier years. This procedural change of the project had implications for the data collection. Students were required to provide two sets of data to the teacher/ researcher. Therefore, this component of the research project was contingent on the initial findings of student contributions to the assignment.

The final analyses are based on a relatively small corpus of selected data. However, given the fine granularity of analysis, it affords a deep understanding of the intricacies of the participants' interaction. Observations at this level can only be done within the scope of this study with a well-delimited corpus.

Analysis Part 1
Orientation to and achievement of task

Notes on the structure of Analysis Part 1

Chapters 4, 5 and 6, are relevant to the present study in that they provide an analysis of participants' orientations towards the tasks at hand and the achievement of them in the process of preparing for their group project. The data reveals contextual features that shape and are shaped by interaction observed suggestion sequences, the analysis of which is presented in Chapters 8 and 9.

The three chapters in this first part of the analysis aim to answer questions that are posed in Chapter 1, Section 1.11. These questions are related to the first objective that is articulated there, which is formulated as: *To describe the interaction among students engaged in carrying out a collaborative task within a multilingual, university setting outside of class*.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will attempt to answer the question of how students interpret the activity in which they are engaged. More specifically (as outlined in Chapter 1), these analyses will address: *1) how students make visible their interpretations of the task; 2) towards what elements of the task the interactas orient as being relevant in the achievement of that task; and 3) how they negotiate and achieve a collective understanding of their activities.*

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the emerging interpretations of the participants regarding the task at hand, or the meeting procedures. Chapter 5 explores the students' understanding of what constitutes a good oral presentation, their group task. In Chapter 6, the students' orientations towards part assignment and the properties of a presentation part within the context of the oral presentation project is examined.

The data analyzed in this section come from meetings that the participants had organized outside of class for different stages of preparation for their upcoming oral presentation. In these data, the participants can be seen rehearsing sections of the PowerPoint presentations that each group member had already created individually. Editing activity of this PowerPoint presentation is also observed among the interactants in the extracts presented. Some data

from an earlier meeting of one of the groups is also analyzed. The general organizational instructions for this work stage, as well as for the overall assignment, were already discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4

Doing a meeting

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of contextual features of interaction related to the students' interpretations of the task at hand and that emerge during the students' meetings. In particular, this section explores students' orientations to and interpretations of the tasks involved in achieving 'doing a meeting' in preparation for a presentation. The main way that the students' orientations are observed is through: 1) talk regarding the recording aspect of the task at hand; 2) explicit reference to procedures and instructions of the task at hand; and 3) interactional conduct to accomplish the task at hand.

The analysis begins in Section 4.2 with a general description of how the students display their interpretation and organization of the meeting activity, or the business at hand. Participants' orientations towards the co-construction of the task-as-process (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1) are considered. In Section 4.3, the fluid nature of students' interpretations of the tasks is explored. Section 4.4 studies how participants' interpretations of the task are revealed in their collaborative work on the oral presentation. Section 4.5 analyses the ways students explicitly delimit the activity appropriate to the task at hand. Finally, Section 4.6 discusses the general findings of the data presented in Chapter 4.

4.2 Making interpretations visible

Given the relative non-confining nature of the instructions for the meeting task, the type of activity the students engaged in, the settings, and participation patterns observed across the data varied greatly. In the analysis of the students' interaction seen in these data, it is important to bear in mind the students' orientations towards what constitutes recordable activity as a fundamental part of their interpretation of the tasks normatively expected for this meeting activity. Some groups, for example, interpreted the meetings strictly as occasions for rehearsal, and thus only included the delivery of their presentation in the recording without interruptions. The activity other groups recorded during their meeting included rehearsing as well other types of participation that emerged throughout their practicing. These included proposing changes to the text or script, correcting mispronounced words, and problem-solving projects, among other types of interactions.

What is not known is what type of activity the students engaged in outside of the recording. There is no data indicating whether the students used their meeting time to prepare or practice their rehearsal activity prior to their recording it, for example. Orientations to the interaction deemed as legitimate for recording, which they would then have to turn in to their teacher, could only be seen when the camera was not shut off while the students addressed this issue. In these occasions, when students allowed their more candid interactions to be recorded, orientations towards and interpretations of the overall institutional task objectives could be observed in topical and propositional content, as well as in interactional conduct that emerged over the course of their meetings.

In the following extract, for example, group members, Laia, Rosa and Cristina, have started to record their meeting. Once the camera has started 'rolling' and they have greeted it, or the teacher (she is addressed by name), two of the members seem unsure of how to continue with the activity. The task is then negotiated among them.

EXTRACT 4-1

1	LAI:	hi guys
		((looking at camera; then bends down; laughs))
2	ROS:	we are recording our presentation
		((laughs; addressing camera))
3	CRI:	a- and
4	ROS:	*i tu*
		and you
5	CRI:	((jumps into view standing behind others))
6		we are Rosa¿ Laia¿ and Cristina.
		((facing camera and indicating each participant with hands; takes a seat))
7	LAI:	and we are record- (no)
8		we are recording our presentation in the_
		((glancing at camera and computer screen))
9	ROS:	-computers room
		((all laugh))
10		[okay}
11	CRI:	[our presentation¿]
		((looks at others then back to camera))
12		eh talks about remova- removable appliances.
		((looks toward others))
13	LAI:	tch (.3)
14		a:and
		((lifts eyebrows, looking at screen, moves head towards her right))
15		we have done (.) our presentation¿
16	ROS:	*espera* ( ) *agafa* ( )?
		wait hold
		((gesturing with hands as if to take the camera from the tripod))
17	CRI:	no
18	ROS:	(xxx) (.3)
19	LAI:	so:o (.2)
		((raises eyebrows looks at CRI))
20	LAI:	*què*?
		what

```
21   CRI:   definition
22          what are removable appliance
23   LAI:   we try to do it (.2)
24   ROS:   like a presen↑↓tation
            ((looking at CRI))
25   LAI:   like a presen↑↓tation
            ((looking at CRI))
26   CRI:   ((shrugs shoulders))
27          what ( )
            ((looking at ROS))
28   ROS:   i- it suppose that we a:are
            ((gesturing with hands like typing; raises eyebrows;
            laughing))
29   CRI:   planning
30   LAI:   planning
31          but we have already done [all the]
32   CRI:                            [ ( ...because your camera) ]
33          ((looking at ROS ; all laughing))
34   ROS:   i forget my:y (
            ((laughing)) card
            ((looking at camera))
35          hhh .h my memory care [so mandy ((teacher))]
36   LAI:                         [I think that] we
37          we can explain our presentation ((looks at camera))
38          as e:eh if we were doing it in class.
            ((glances at Rosa))
39          (.2)
40          °no?°
            ((glances at Cristina))
41   CRI:   the ↑↓yes
            ((nodding))
42          i thought we [( )]
43   LAI:                [okay]
44          so i began
45   ROS:   °okay°
46   LAI:   i begin
            ((moves seat closer to computer; laughs))
47          eh removable appliances.
48          tch e:eh removable appliancee is eh a-
49          ((continues her part))
```

This data show students orienting to the institutional aspect of the task by greeting and directing their talk to the teacher (or the camera in lines 1-11) and in fact addressing her by name (line 35). In Lines 7-8, Laia announces the activity they are in progress of doing, and Rosa completes Laia's turn (line 9) with reference to the location of their current activity. Cristina further announces the title or topic of their presentation in lines 11-12, and Laia begins to explain what they have accomplished prior to this recording in lines 13-15.

At line 16, Rosa refers to a technical aspect of the task and seems to inquire, through embodied actions, about the position of the camera. She code-switches, thereby marking a shift from in participation frameworks. The footing changes from one that had included the institutional presence through the camera, to a framework that was related to the oral presentation project carried out in their L3.

Laia initiates a turn (line 19) with a stretched discourse marker, *so*, which would connect the previous talk to her next relevant action. After a delay, she hands the floor over to Cristina through a request for information formulation, *què* (*what*), in line 20. This is a discourse related code-switch (Auer, 1988), which indicates again a participation framework other than the one during which they oriented toward the institutional task or to the teacher. By selecting Cristina to take the next turn to supply an answer to her question, Laia projects her uncertainty of how to continue the task at hand. Cristina understanding of Laia's action is seen in her response with a candidate beginning of the presentation (lines 21-22), for which she uses quoted speech. She demonstrates, rather than announces, the action that they may now pursue.

Laia begins her response by seeking confirmation of her understanding of Cristina's proposal for their next project, by explicitly specifying the type of activity (line 23). Rosa completes Laia's turn (line 24) with the manner of "doing it"—*like a presentation*—thereby displaying her alignment with Laia's interpretation of Cristina's proposal. Laia confirms Rosa's candidate completion (Lerner, 2004) of her turn by repeating Rosa' utterance in line 24, and both Laia and Rosa turn their gaze to Cristina. In this way, they display their orientation towards Cristina as the interactant expected to speak next, possibly to confirm their jointly articulated interpretation of her proposal. Their prosodic patterns may indicate that they were not expecting the course of action that Cristina has suggested. Cristina's strongly marked embodied actions of shrugging her shoulders and gazing at Rosa steadily as she utters, *what* (line 27), projects a request for Rosa to account for the doubt displayed regarding the rehearsing activity Cristina has proposed.

Rosa articulates her idea of what the task at hand should entail in line 28. She refers to her interpretation of the task instructions by invoking a reference to an outside authority and obligation with the lexical choice of "it suppose" to introduce her idea. Cristina and Laia complete Rosa's turn in lines 29 and 30 to identify the activity that Rosa was most likely suggesting as the shared and institutional objective of the meeting. It is Laia who gives an account of why Rosa's proposed course of action might not be the appropriate one for their meeting (line 31): they have already completed the planning part of their task. She displays her disagreement with Rosa's articulated plan of action by initiating her account with a contrastive marker, *but*.

Cristina (line 32) begins to extend Laia's argument by giving an account for why they do not have evidence, or a recording, of the planning they have presumably completed. Rosa continues this explanation in lines 34-35, by addressing her talk to the teacher (camera) and essentially taking the blame for not having recorded their planning. In line 36, Laia overlaps Rosa's turn to takes up Cristina's original proposal to rehearse their presentation (lines 36-38), though she formulates it as

her own proposal by initiating her turn with *I think*. She deploys linguistic resources to project the idea that her proposal is an option (we *can*) that all of them (*we* can) can engage in. She turns to Cristina and requests confirmation through a polar question token, *no*? (Line 40). Cristina displays approval with marked prosody that seems hearable as having the function of "of course"—a response that may project a moral stance regarding Laia's obligation to have already known Cristina's position (Stivers, 2011), as this activity was what she had proposed earlier. Cristina accounts for this stance by formulating an *I thought* utterance (line 42) to indicate that this plan was her original proposal (Stevanovic, 2013).

Laia overlaps Cristina's turn with an agreement token, *okay* (line 43), and announces her action to start the presentation (line 44), thus complying with this proposal. She initiates this announcement with a discourse marker, *so*, thereby connecting Cristina's previous turn regarding their course of action to her next action. Rosa displays her agreement with an *okay* token (line 45), and Laia begins her rehearsing in line 47, following a self-initiated repair (line 46) to correct the verb tense of her previous turn in line 44.

This datum and analysis have shown the participants' varying and unfolding interpretations of what the task at hand should entail during this meeting, which is to be recorded. They often display orientations to the institutional/pedagogical dimension of the task by attending to the actual conduct involved with recording (line 16-17, for example), at times by directing their talk to the camera (lines 1-11; 34-35).

One member, Rosa, referred to an outside authority to display her reasoning behind her interpretation of what the task should comprise (*it suppose*, line 28). She also provided an account to the teacher, presumably the authority she was invoking, regarding why they did not have a recording of this proposed activity.

Another fairly obvious display of their understanding regarding the institutional layer of task objectives is the very fact that they are mainly communicating in English, their third language. This is not their usual practice, and this can be seen by the code-switching when discussing topics that they seemingly do not interpret as being relevant or outside of the participation framework that includes the institutional representative, the camera, or teacher. By communicating in English, therefore, their orientation to the omnipresent task of recording their meeting is seen to include the language component of the task requirement.

Another important aspect of these participants' interpretation of the task is related to their orientations toward the collective nature of the task. They frequently pursue confirmation for proposal actions and understandings as to what activity

they should jointly decide to embark on. Furthermore, the very formulations of their turns that delineate task activities are collaboratively constructed.

We can see these interactional phenomena starting with Laia's prompt for assistance in determining their next course of action in lines 19-20. The proposal of rehearsing is put on the table by Cristina (line 21-22). Rosa referred to an alternative activity, which she, in fact, had considered to be generally understood as the original objective of the meeting: planning the presentation. Talk regarding these options is co-constructed with approval for the rehearsal activity suggestion being negotiated over several turns until consensus is reached, and compliance of this defined course of action ultimately carried out by Laia.

This datum shows that at the very beginning of this group's meeting, different ideas for the task at hand were collaboratively proposed and treated: *rehearsing* ("we can explain our presentation as if we were doing it in class", lines 37-38) and *planning* for the presentation, and that initially, it seemed that the rehearsing proposal was taken up as the jointly established project.

4.3 Fluidity of task interpretation

Nevertheless, as CA methodology can demonstrate, no status or state of affairs is constant, but rather is changing and fluid, emerging turn-by-turn over the course of an interactional event. The interpretation of the task at hand is continuously negotiated throughout the achievement of a collaborative task (Mondada & Pekarek, 2004; Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010).

The next extract is a continuation of Laia's rehearsal that was begun at the end of Extract 4-1 (five lines later). The other two members have suspended their talk, and Laia has been engaged in the rehearsing activity over several turns. Doing rehearsing, in this case, comprises directing attention to the PowerPoint slides, which appear on the computer screen in front of Laia, and reading her script. At the end of the script associated with the slide Laia is treating, Rosa makes a bid for the floor. She proposes that Laia's behavior is not aligned with her own interpretation of the task activity.

EXTRACT 4-2

1	LAI:	and functional appliances.
2 →	ROS:	*però hauríem de fer-ho en plan con↑↓versa*
		((looks at LAI; squinting eyes))
3		but we should do this like a conversation
4		((LAI and CRI look at ROS))
5		(4.0)
6	LAI:	°*bueno*°
		((looks down, slightly shrugs shoulder))
		good (("well"))
7	CRI:	*continua continua*

```
            continue continue
            ((smiles; looks at LAI))
8    LAI:   ((laughs))
9    ROS:   no(en plan )
               like
            ((laughs))
10          para un segon
            stop for a second
            ((points to camera; gets up from chair))
11    LAI:  no [no paris no paris no no no no no paris]
                don't stop don't stop no no no no don't stop
12    CRI:     [no no no no (perquè pots seguir-ho a sobre)]
                            because you can continue over it
13    ROS:  a no? (xxx)
            no?
14    LAI:  que no no no no no no
            no no no no no no
15          [no paris]
            don't stop
16    ROS:  [( )]
17    CRI:  °bueno és igual°
            well it doesn't matter
18    ROS:  no però en plan
            no but like
19          eh definition e:em
            ((sits down))
20    CRI:  well eh [continue] ((addressing Laia))
21    LAI:          [( )]
            ((all look at screen))
22    ROS:  tipo definition. e:eh (..) umm (.)
            like
23          what no? en plan-
                 no  like
24          what we need to:o-
            ((spoken as if she is explaining the content in
            a "conversational" style; waving hand seemingly
            to indicate carrying on the talk))
25    CRI:  well
26    ROS: make our
27    CRI:   [i- in]
28    ROS:   [removable appliance °and you°]
29          ((gestures with hand for the next person to speak as in
            giving a response; laughs))
30    CRI:  next slices  [we:e eh]
31    LAI:  °vale°
             okay
32          which are the characteristics of ↑base  plates.
            ((makes exaggerated facial expressions and intonation
            -in a seemingly sarcastic manner; raises hand to emphasize
            dramatically; Rosa laughs; Cristina smiles))
33          we need a horse ↑sho:o ((horse shoe))
34          ( ) uniform thickness of approximately two millimeters¿
            ((punctuated intonation seemingly aligning with ROS'
            suggestion))
```

This extract demonstrates that even after the meeting task was explicitly defined and supposedly agreed to (in Extract 4-1), interpretations of the task at hand and

what the ongoing activity should entail are not totally aligned among the interactants.

As Laia comes to the end of explaining the contents on a PowerPoint slide, Rosa initiates a proposal related to the delivery of the presentation content (line 2). She code-switches from English to Catalan, thus marking a shifting of participation frameworks: from one of a speaker or lecturer with an audience who has suspended their talk to that of group members, or peers, discussing together the procedures for the task at hand.

Rosa initiates her turn with the discourse marker, *but*, marking a topical transition and also adumbrating disagreement with the previous action. Her suggestion is formulated to include the modal form, *should*, which displays a moral stance regarding her expectations of how to carry out the task. Rosa also refers to the collective responsibility implicated, using the first person plural form of the verb, (we), though the location of her suggestion, which is following Laia's talk—the only presentation talk until this moment, is referring to Laia's actions.

Besides the morphosyntactic resources Rosa uses to shape her turn, she deploys embodied actions to accompany her verbal interaction (slightly shaking her head from one side to the other, and narrowing her eyes). Laia delays her response to Rosa (line 5), which projects a yet-unstated, dispreferred response regarding Rosa's assessment of the state of affairs—that they are not doing what they should be doing. The position (during Laia's rehearsing) and design of Rosa turn makes her stance perceivable as a criticism of Laia's performance as a presenter.

Laia aligns with Rosa's action by stopping her rehearsing and turning her gaze towards Rosa. However, her disagreement is projected as there is a four-second delay before she responds (line 6) non-committedly using various disaffiliation markers: speaking in a lower volume, looking downward, using a turn-entry device, *well*, which can be hearable as discomfort or a potentially prefaced disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984), and slightly shrugs her shoulders.

Cristina does not align or affiliate with Rosa's proposal (line 7) in that she urges Laia to resume her rehearsing activity without acknowledging Rosa's suggestion to modify her delivery conduct; she does not turn her gaze to Rosa or direct her turn to her. She seems to invite laughter (Jefferson, 1979) with her smile at the end of the turn, perhaps as a way to close the current topic (Holt, 2010) or to dispel any discomfort that this sequence may have engendered.

Laia affiliates with Cristina's conduct by taking up the laughter in line 8, while Rosa initially withholds her laughter to pursue the topic (Jefferson, 1979) she introduced. She initiates her turn with a contrastive token, *no* (line 9) perhaps to negate the treatment of her action as being critical. Rosa joins in with the laughter

as well, but then glances at and points to the camera, before announcing her action to stop the camera (line 10), presumably to further outline her suggestion of how they should continue, which she does later.

During the next sequence of turns (lines 11-16), the co-participants display their disagreement about the status of the recording: whether it should be halted, as Rosa has gotten up from her seat to do, or it should continue, as is demanded by Cristina and Laia. The latter's uses of the imperative form (lines 11 and 15) increasingly marked prosodic resources and louder volume (line14) display her disagreement with Rosa's attempts to stop the camera.

Rosa complies with the others' request that she leave the camera on, re-takes her seat and pursues the explication of her interpretation of the appropriate meeting procedures. She re-initiates her turn with a contrastive marker *no-but* (line 18) to format and connect her present action with her previous try at explaining her stance in line 9. She begins to explain the manner in which she believes they should behave in the recording. The contents of her turn, *en plan*, or *like* (line 18) suggest a description is forthcoming.

She then initiates a sequence during which she models her idea by using quoted speech, formulating her turn in English (line 19). This practice is similar to the one Cristina had utilized in Extract 4-1 (line 21). In fact she begins her turn with the same introductory device that Cristina had suggested (*definition*), also deploying a louder volume to demonstrate her notion of an appropriate candidate turn.

Cristina attempts once more, in line 20, to persuade Laia to resume her turn. She uses, *well*, as a turn-entry device, but does so in English—thus aligning with Rosa's action, though not affiliating with it. Rosa, however, is not sidetracked with the resistance from the others, and continues to exhibit her interpretation of the discursive style in which they should proceed.

Rosa elaborates her explanation of the type of interaction she is trying to clarify (lines 22-24). She restarts her quoted sample turn, again using a rhetorical question, or a known-answer question (Searle, 1969; Koshik, 2002) accompanied with embodied actions. This indicates that this type of conversational activity would continue flowing in the way she is performing.

Cristina tries again to display her disaffiliation with Rosa's action (line 25, *well*) but Rosa does not relinquish the floor. She continues, overlapping Cristina's talk (line 27) to complete her depiction of her suggested discourse style with quoted speech.

Her performance seems to convey a more interactional approach to their activity. In this tiered turn (lines 23-24, 26, 28) she requests information in the form of a question related to content from Laia's part (removable appliances). She then

indicates by means of a reference to another participant (line 28, *and you*) and also embodied action using her hands (line 29) that another participant should respond to the question. These actions display orientations that are consistent with her explicit reference to a conversation type of discourse in her turn in line 2.

Cristina seeks to downplay the import of Rosa's proposed alteration of Laia's conduct by referring to their future activity (next *slices*—'slides', in lines 27 and 30). This is another urge to move on, but in so doing Cristina also acknowledges a possible application of Rosa's suggestion for later slides, or another time in their meeting.

Ultimately, it is Laia who manages the closing of this sequence. She utters a weak approval token, *okay*, code-switching and also lowering her volume (line 31), and launches a rehearsing sequence. Her talk is heavily marked with exaggerated prosodic resources and dramatic embodied actions (facial expression; raised eyebrows, widened eyes, outreached hand). These resources display, on one hand, her understanding and supposed uptake of Rosa's suggestion to make her delivery sound more conversational. On the other hand, they also make visible Laia's stance of resistance to Rosa's possible criticism of her previous presentation delivery. This orientation is recognized by the others as can be seen in Rosa laughter and Cristina's smile. They both, however, suspend talk, and give Laia the floor once more.

This stretch of talk reveals diversity in orientations toward how an institutional task should be carried out, how they actually evolve, becoming explicit turn by turn and through the renegotiation and management of disagreements embedded in an ongoing activity. The participants' interpretations and execution of task procedures are not stable (Mondada & Pekarek, 2004) even after the group members had jointly, or vocally, established their plan of action.

Changing interpretations regarding the goals of a task as well as procedures over the course of this type of setting are not difficult to envision, as prior to this meeting, the participants' had not rehearsed their parts together. Their co-performance materialized during this event, giving them a true glimpse of what their presentation might actually look like. Upon experiencing their collective work—also as a united product—for the first time, it is possible that this outcome might not align with their a priori interpretations or their explicitly defined plans.

Such a scenario describes this group's case; the extract shows that Rosa deemed it sufficiently important to stop the ongoing activity in order to topicalize the unfolding task performance as a source of trouble and to articulate her version of appropriate task procedures. Her interpretation of the task regarding the type of interaction that should be recorded had apparently differed from the performance

she witnessed in Laia's presentation. She performed different actions and used different resources to make her interpretation understood (*we should do it like a conversation*) as well as to construct a proposal for how to carry out her idea of appropriate interaction. She achieved these actions in spite of the resistance displayed by her co-participants and even though her proposal was not seriously taken up.

Another orientation to the institutional norms of this task is exhibited in the sequence about whether to stop the camera or not. Rosa's reference to the recording action and her desire to stop the camera displays an attitude of what constitutes legitimate contents for the recording. Namely, she displays a stance that the type of talk that deals with negotiating task procedures does not fall under the realm of the institutional task.

Cristina and Laia display strong stances regarding Rosa's suggestion to halt the recording. They achieve this through the repetitive commands for Rosa not to stop the recording, as well as with increasing volume of their turns. Nevertheless, Cristina's account for their adamant disagreement, or why it is not necessary to pause the recording (line 12, *because you can continue over it*), aligns with Rosa's stance towards what content their recording should and should not include.

Cristina's continued efforts to close the sequence of Rosa's intervention, and allow Laia to return to her rehearsing in the way that she was carrying it out, may be related to any number of reasons. These include maintaining progressivity of the task or perhaps dispelling tension that Laia seems to display, to name just two. Cristina's interactional conduct demonstrates either an affiliation to Laia's interpretation of how to do the task, or it may solely show an agency-centered orientation to carrying out the task. In other words, her stance may be only related to speakerhood (Goffman, 1981; Enfield, 2011), regarding how much control or responsibility a speaker has over the delivery aspect of presenting.

The interactions seen in this datum could, therefore, make visible not only the participants' articulations of preferred procedures for this activity, but also entitlement associated with proposing them as well as executing them according to their individual interpretations. In fact, despite the turns indicating fairly strong levels of disaffiliation towards Rosa's actions, both Cristina and Laia ultimately show weak signs of a concessional stance towards incorporating this "unwelcome" proposal, Cristina talks of later *slices* (line 30), or slides, finally addressing Rosa and perhaps agreeing to consider incorporating Rosa's proposal for another part of the presentation. Laia, though in an apparently sarcastic way, complies with Rosa's suggestion by changing the features of her talk when she resumes her rehearsing.

These extracts, then, show the fluidity of task interpretations through the negotiating sequences that emerge before and during the performance of

presenting. The evolving orientations are manifested by means of resources deployed to formulate propositional content in the interactants' turns, the shaping of their turn designs, and the organization of their sequences around the participation frameworks that do rehearsing and do co-constructing of the presentation. They demonstrate how the co-participants manage the shifting of footings, from doing carrying out their task according to their individual interpretation, to negotiating carrying out the task. In turn, their orientations towards the collective and also individual nature of this enterprise are also revealed.

The attention to discursive style for this task did not end with the sequence shown in Extract 4-2. Though Rosa's proposal for their meeting interaction is not taken up by her co-participants, she persists in demonstrating her interpretation of the task through the performance of her own presentation part. Her rehearsal behavior displays a type of discourse style that contrasts with Laia's when she initiates rehearsal activity for her part.

Extract 4-3

```
1 ROS:      ehm retainers.
2           ((moves seat closer to the computer))
3           ((sits up))
4 LAI:      què ( )
5           ((Laia and Cristina smile; Rosa laughs))
6 ROS:      to keep a the
            ((gazes at camera))
7           dental plate on his place
8           there are two
            ((looks at camera))
9           uh retainers.
            ((gestures with 2 fingers to list))
10          the adam's anchorage¿
            ((looks at camera))
11          eh we use it in
            ((looks at camera))
12          permana:a-
13          permanent molars¿
            ((looks at camera))
15          and they have a:a
            ((looks at camera; hand gestures to depict the shape))
13          crown shape.
```

This extract demonstrates the type of conduct that Rosa believes is appropriate for this meeting task: presenting the material in a way that includes the non-presenters, in this case the camera. She extends the participation framework to include an audience through use of embodied actions such as gazing at the camera and using hand gestures that are made visible for the camera. Simultaneously, she does not maintain a downward gaze toward her presentation slides to read her part. She demonstrates her avoidance of the behavior she interprets as being inappropriate for this or the classroom's interactional space.

The three extracts presented in Sections 4.2. and 4.3 show not only the participants' orientations to the requirements of the task at hand, but they also show that: 1) the a priori interpretations thereof are not always aligned or shared; they, therefore, need to be 2) negotiated; and in turn 3) they are situated in the unfolding actions of the participants' meeting activity. These types of sequences, during which interpretations of the meeting objectives are made visible and at times made explicit, emerge at different times during the meeting.

These data also shed light on areas where agency can be seen to play a part in the achievement of the task. Though the participants in this group seem to orient to a need for consensus in the negotiation of script and text of the overall presentation, there is still space for agency in terms of the style displayed in the delivery of each participant's content. Disagreement in this area made this dimension visible, but it did not impede the achievement of the students' shared task.

Orientations to a further phenomenon shown in these extracts is related to behavior as part of a participation framework that includes the camera—a proxy of the teacher, or an institutional representative in the carrying out of this task. Sequences from which references to the camera (its position and recording status) emerged as well as those showing embodied multimodal actions oriented to the camera's visual scope show a dimension of the students' interpretation of the meeting task that shapes and constrains their interactions.

4.4 Interpretations revealed in co-construction of the presentation

A variety of interpretations regarding what the meeting time should encompass was revealed during the students' meeting interactions. Similar to the data seen in the previous sections, the following extract taken from Rita's, Laura's and Gabriela's meeting indicated their orientations to the type of behavior the interactants should maintain within a participation framework that includes the camera, or the teacher. This extract shows the students in their first of two pre-presentation meetings as they are listing different aspects of the lecture they had attended and needed to prepare for the presentation. Laura is writing these items on the whiteboard when Rita signals to Laura that she should consider the camera's field of vision.

EXTRACT 4-4

```
1 RIT:      mmhmm
2 GAB:      ((nods head))
3 LAU:      and the choice abo:out
4           ((turns to white board))
5 RIT:      how we choose
6 GAB:      yeah (right)
7 LAU:      ((writing on whiteboard))
9           °how we choose°
```

```
10 RIT:     okay
11 →        mira a la cámara
            look at the camera
            ((points to camera))
12          que sino (xxx)
            otherwise
13 LAU:     ((continues writing))
            (8s)
            ((moves away from what's she's writing
            allowing for better camera shot of her text))
14          and the choice.
15 GAB:     mmhmm
16 LAU:     a:and
17 RIT:     yeah
            ((6.0s; Laura continues writing))
18 LAU:     ((moves away from her text to face camera;
            points to what she has written))
19          a:and when we talk about the choice
```

This extract shows an aligned orientation to what behavior the recording dimension of the meeting task should involve. Laura's conduct of writing on the whiteboard so as to make her work visible only to her colleagues displays her orientation to a participation framework within which only the persons physically present are taken into account. Rita shifts the framework in line 11 by code-switching and using an embodied action of pointing to draw Laura's attention to the camera. Though we cannot understand the contents of Rita's account for why Laura should orient to the camera's presence (*otherwise*… in line 12), her turn is hearable to Laura as a suggestion to which she should comply. This is seen in her following actions of moving away from the text she is producing (line 13), facing the camera and pointing to her work in line 18.

Such interaction again shows students' awareness or orientation to the omni-relevant institutional layer of the requirements for this meeting task. In this case, the interactants not only showed their stances about showcasing their orally constructed ideas, but also their written work and the ecology of their setting. Including a clear view for the camera of their interaction and work had an influence on their physical positions in the setting. They understood that all of their conduct and discourse mode was for scrutiny.

This group was different from the other two groups in that they always included the text and PowerPoint slides in the view of the camera of both of their meetings. In Rosa's, Laia's and Cristina's group, it was evident that they were working on their presentation's slides as they gazed at their computer screen while typing, but their work was never made available to the camera's field of vision. This arrangement constituted the most prevalent ecology seen across the data, which may indicate that most students interpreted their spoken script as being the main activity to be included in the recording.

This group was part of the third cohort from whom two videos were collected. In the recording of their second meeting, while they are rehearsing, another type of behavior that they consider to be part of this meeting activity is made explicit. The group members have just finished editing a part of Rita's content regarding the topic, slot size of an orthodontic appliance. As this part of the script has been re-worked, Rita requests that she be allowed to practice the new part.

Extract 4-5

```
1 RIT:      [okay so le-]
2           ((gets whiteboard eraser and turns to erase her drawing))
3 LAU:      of the
4           of the slot size
5 RIT: →    let me practice that
6           ((laughs))
7 GAB:      okay
8 RIT:      .hhh
9           so ↑there's a question
10          that we have to take in count
11          >there's something we have to ge-<
12          take in count
```

In line 2, Rita's embodied action of erasing the content she'd previously written on the whiteboard as visual support to her previous explication introduces her actual modification of the script. Laura draws her attention to the particular item that was changed in line 4 (the slot size). Rita then makes her request for the opportunity to practice the material they have just co-constructed for her script, a request to which the others align. In lines 8-12, Rita is given the floor to practice the newly created topic.

The participants' orientation to this interactional space as a place for practice of their script is displayed in the propositional content of Rita's request as well as her action of practicing a formulation of the script, a behavior seen as practice through her re-starting of the scripted utterance in line 11.

This extract also shows participants' orientations to the re-creation or co-creation of their script during the meeting time, that their presentation is not "written in stone". Modifications of their presentations are still possible, and though they have similar levels of understanding of their presentation content, there are alternative options to the formulation of the material, and they do not take for granted the competence of being able to deliver this information without practicing. In this case, this means saying the material aloud a few times.

Once again, orientations to the scope of practice activity that are displayed within this group's interaction differed from those in other groups. While other groups did suggest changes in the scripts and texts presented during the meetings, and some suggestions for alternate formulations were taken up, this group was the

only one to *explicitly* refer to the practicing and also to actually practice the edited presentation piece. The main orientation to doing practicing in the other groups was seen in behavior related to the repetition of correct pronunciations of terms as indicated in an earlier section.

Some of the data that have been presented above have shown the interactants involved in problem-solving activity, which was situated in projects of editing processes. The data provide evidence that the participants did interpret this meeting task as a space for modifying aspects of the presentation, and this type of activity sometimes led to problem-solving interaction to co-create or re-create their scripts and texts as well as searches to find information to their questions.

The following extract is a continuation of a problem-solving project among Rosa, Cristina and Laia. It is part of a very long stretch of talk during which the participants had interacted to determine a word for the concept of *proclination* and other related words and phrasing for a simple sentence they wanted to include in their slide and script. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, the participants have just decided to formulate that concept Cristina was explaining in her part as: *buccal direction to pro-incline and distal or mesial direction to get closer*. Laia has finished typing this phrase, and they have paused to look at it when Cristina suggests an additional way to grammatically package this item.

Extract 4-6

```
1  LAI      [a:ah una cosa]
                  one thing
2  CRI:     [>i can say< either]
            ((leans forward to look at ROS; ROS leans forward so that
            they can gaze directly at each other.))
3           either=
4  ROS:     ((looks at CRI))
5  CRI:     =to separate
6           o- or_
7           t- ge- get closer¿
8  ROS:     ((raises eyebrows; nods))
9  CRI:     in theory is correct?
10 ROS:     crec que sí
            i believe so
11          ((turns to her computer to search for the structure))
12  CRI:    ((gazes at ROS' computer showing attention to another word
            search))
13  LAI:    ((continuing to look at the shared computer screen))
14          >buccal direction to proincline¿<
            ((reading PPt slide))
15          >distal or mesial direction to separa:ate¿<
16          or¿ (.)
17          to get¿ (.)
18          ((typing 3 sec))
19          get closer.
20          (5.0)
            ((Rosa and Cristina looking at Rosa's computer; Laia
            looking at central screen))
21  LAI:    jo ho posaria aqui a baix
```

```
            i would put it down here
22          i ho  expli[ques]
            and you explain it
23  ROS:                [yeah.]
24          porque es en plan
            because it is like
            ((turns to look at CRI;  CRI looks at ROS' computer))
25          o tal¿
            either this
            ((moves  hand to her left))
26          o tal.
            or that
            ((moves hand to her right))
27  CRI:    sí.
            yes
28          surt?
            does it come out
            ((looking at ROS' computer))
29  ROS:    ((looks at her computer))
30  LAI:    ((turns head towards right shoulder and looks at PPt
slide))
31  ROS:    sí
            yes
32          tomar o té¿ o café.
            have tea or coffee
33          ((laughs))
34  CRI:    ((looks at central computer))
35          >distal or mesial to separate¿<
36          either to:o_
            ((moves head towards her right))
37  ROS:    ((looks at central computer))
38  CRI:    either to separate¿
            ((moves head to left))
39          or
            ((moves head to her right))
40          to get closer.
41          yes i think it's correct this
42          ((clears throat))
43  LAI:    i'll write it,
44          either to separate or get closer
            ((typing))
45  ROS:    ((looks at her computer))
46  CRI:    or if you don't want to put
47          i- i say it
            ((pushes hand forward palm towards herself))
48  ROS:    ((looks back at central computer))
49  LAI:    it's just a word
            ((looks up and towards CRI))
50  CRI:    ok
```

This lengthy extension of a project was launched to modify the wording of a simple sentence. It evolved over several moves during which the participants collaboratively engaged in problem solving activity. This extract represents fifty-three seconds out of over six minutes that these students dedicated to co-constructing a formulation to describe a fairly simple concept in their presentation. In line 2, Cristina launches her suggestion to use the structure, *either-or*, in the configuration of the sentence they had jointly written. She selects Rosa as her recipient to her request for confirmation that this grammatical

structure is appropriate for the phrasing of this sentence. The request to confirm her query by means of an Internet search is understood by Rosa as she complies and immediately starts to look for an answer on her computer (line 12).

At the same time, Laia is visibly pursuing the formulation of the sentence in written form on their PowerPoint slide as she reads the text aloud (lines 14-19) and continues typing on the computer located in front of her. These co-occurring activities — searching for information on the computer and dedicating attention to the formulation on the PowerPoint slide — continue for 5 seconds without any talk among the interactants. Laia then launches a proposal that they display the sentence on the slide as the way she has just written and quoted it (lines 21-22), and that Cristina articulate the sentence with the *either or* construction orally.

This suggestion is not taken up by Laia's co-participants, as Rosa and Cristina continue to resolve the question regarding the *either-or* structure. Rosa code-switches to clarify the concept they are looking for (lines 23-26), which Cristina confirms as being correct (line 27). She then asks if the information they are interested in has been accessed by Rosa (line 31), to which Rosa responds affirmatively and also reads the information from the site she has found (lines 31-32). She thereby corroborates Cristina's original hypothesis about the use of this structure. Based on this information, Cristina re-formulates the sentence in question to include the *either-or* structure aloud (lines 34-40), and then assesses her newly constructed sentence as being correct (line 41).

Laia announces and then performs her action to retype the sentence with this formulation (lines 43-44). Cristina mitigates her proposal to include this revised text by offering to accept Laia's seemingly ignored suggestion posed in lines 21 and 22. Laia rejects this offer by assessing the modification as minimal (just a word), and Cristina closes the very long sequence with an *okay* token (line 50.)

This transcript has highlighted the interactants' orientations to the importance of appropriate and correct formulations of their script and text. They do so by means of their sustained engagement in their problem-solving behavior to formulate only one small item of their presentation. It has further highlighted the type of activity that was appropriate for this meeting context. In other words, this meeting time was a legitimate space for participants to work together to revise and co-produce presentation material. This position may be supported by the fact that the students included this stretch of talk in their video that would later be seen by their instructor.

This particular extract also showed interactants engaging in parallel yet different activity as they all worked to solve a problem—constructing a phrase for their presentation. Rosa and Cristina engaged in the search for a grammatical structure

in compliance to Cristina's proposed reformulation of a sentence they had created together, and Laia continued her typing and vocal reflection of the same item. The object of Laia's suggestion in lines 21-22 relates to the mode of articulation (written form on the PowerPoint slide versus oral form of the script). She builds on her co-participants' action to consider its application in their presentation.

Laia's proposal is not addressed by Cristina or Rosa until they have found the answer to Cristina's grammar question, and she has incorporated the information into the sentence she wished to revise. They have worked together on a single "problem" by dedicating attention to different aspects of it. This datum, then showed that parallel activity being carried out within the same interaction space constituted part of the students' interpretation of what type of activity was acceptable during a meeting. Not all interactions or inter-participant conduct included all members at all times. This type of pluri-activity was not seen often in the data, and when it did occur, it was related to problem-solving activity.

4.5 References to types of activity appropriate to meeting tasks

Problem-solving activity was sometimes associated with the search for correct pronunciation. Curiously, though several sequences during which this type of activity emerged were observed over the course Laia's, Rosa's and Cristina's meeting interaction, orientations toward the appropriateness of time spent on this activity seemed to indicate that such a practice that could also be continued outside of the participants' recorded time. In the next extract, Cristina is introducing a topic as part of her rehearsal (the continuation of the preceding extract), when she initiates a search for the pronunciation of the word, *screws*—the topic of the slide.

EXTRACT 4-7

```
1    CRI:  [the third]
2           the third active element is the screws
3           screws?
            ((turning to Laia seemingly to confirm her pronunciation of
            this word))
4    LAI:   screws
            ((skriuz))
5           screws?
6    CRI:   bueno
            well
7    LAI:   [word reference] hh
            ((markedly turns gaze towards Rosa's computer))
8    CRI:   [(xxx )]
9           no
10          howjsay
            ((website for pronunciation))
11   LAI:   howjsay
            ((both Cristina and Laia turn gaze to
              Rosa's computer screen; Rosa starts search))
```

```
12    CRI:   .hh [they are }
13    ROS:       [uhm]
14    CRI:   they are rhythmic and active elements
15           eh that are activated by the patient.
17           a quarter of turn e:eh
16           if we:e (.)
18    LAI:   if we make a quarter of [turn
19    ROS:                          [wait
             ((hand gesture to halt to listen to pronunciation of screw
               all look at Rosa's computer screen))
20           (2.0)
21           ah no
22    LAI:   ((laughs))
23    ROS:   it has no_
24 →LAI:     you look it
             ((glances towards Cristina, then back at Rosa; Rosa looks
             at Laia then Cristina; Cristina looks at Rosa's computer))
25    ROS:   mmm
26    CRI:   voice
27    ROS:   ((laughs))
28    LAI:   we look it in your [hou:se]
29    ROS:                     [altaveus]
                                loud speakers
30    CRI:   yeah yeah yeah
31    LAI:   I think that a.ah
32    CRI:   yeah I will look
33    LAI:   screws [screws]
34    CRI:          [no I look]
35    ROS:    [screws]
36    CRI:    [I look]
             ((waves hand away from herself))
37    LAI:   you search it in your hou[se]
38    CRI:                           [e:h] e:h e:h
39           a quarter of turn¿
```

While the interactants' stances regarding the importance of correct pronunciation are shown through their search to this end, a certain amount of time for this behavior seems to be considered appropriate, or excessive, for the context of their meeting. Cristina launches the problem-solving activity in line 3 by requesting confirmation for her pronunciation of the word, *screws*. Laia complies to Cristina's request by repeating the word. Cristina is apparently not satisfied with this answer as indicated by her non-committing reply, *bueno*, or *well* (Line 6). Laia suggests they consult an outside authority, Word Reference (line 7), and Cristina counters with another source, the website, Howjsay (line 10). They both use embodied actions to request Rosa to look up the pronunciation of this term, which Rosa understands and to which she complies by beginning her search.

Meanwhile, Cristina resumes her rehearsing in lines 12-16. Laia aligns with this action as she completes Cristina's turn in line 18, as Cristina is showing some difficulty in formulating an item of her script. In line 19, Rosa recruits the attention of her co-participants and attempts to play the pronunciation of *screws* on the computer. Laia and Cristina align with Rosa's action as they wait for the emission of the pronunciation while gazing at the computer screen for 2 seconds. The

website fails to emit a sound, and they comment about the lack of sound due to the computer's not possessing speakers (lines 23-26). Cristina completes Rosa's turn with an English word for speakers, *voice*, in line 26.

Previous to this turn completion, however, Laia initiates a turn (line 24) in which projects her attempt to close of the search for the pronunciation of *screws*. She suggests that Cristina look for the pronunciation at home. She re-initiates this action in line 28, and Cristina aligns with her pre-closing action and displays her affiliation with Laia's proposal (line 30) with an agreement token, *yeah*. She goes on to announce her intention to look for the pronunciation at a later time (line 32). Laia articulates her version of this pronunciation (in line 33) as a final attempt to comply with Cristina's initial request for confirmation of the pronunciation.

Rosa aligns to this action by repeating her offered pronunciation. Cristina, however, does not take up Laia's action and again announces her plan to look outside of this meeting time, also deploying a hand gesture to display both her rejection to practice the pronunciation further (line 36). Laia recasts the formulation of this future action by encasing the idea in a full sentence in line 37, and Cristina closes the sequence by resuming her rehearsal activity.

This stretch of talk shows orientations regarding what is considered appropriate and inappropriate activity during the recorded meeting time by invoking another context that would be considered appropriate for a more extended search of information that is not readily available the group. This context comprises another place (home), and in turn, another participation framework in which there is only one actor. Such a reference, therefore, indicates a stance that this type of activity should be carried out—they do not agree to abandon it—but it should be done individually and not within this group work setting. Different activities — problem-solving and rehearsing — are shown to co-emerge, making relevant displays of the interactants' orientation towards what priorities they place in these projects and when and how to achieve them, individually or jointly.

Explicit attention to correct pronunciation during interaction as well as to solving issues related to the group's work occurred frequently across the data. Therefore, this implies that these behaviors were considered sufficiently legitimate to leave as a recorded testament of their work. This extract added a dimension to these activities—how much treatment should be allotted to such a "problem" in a context where a solution is not within their own epistemic access and resources to gain access to this object is not available.

At the same time, this sequence followed another fairly long problem-solving project (part of which is seen in Extracts 4-5 and later in Chapter 5, Extract 5-6). It may be that the students were opting for maintaining the progressivity of their

rehearsing activity rather than engage in another lengthy search. This position, however, is not vocalized.

4.6 Discussion

The data from this chapter has shown students' orientations towards the goals for the meeting component of the oral presentation assignment. Their interpretations of the meeting related tasks were revealed in their explicit reference to the institutional dimension, or their understanding of the instructions outlined in class by the teacher.

Their behavior related to the recording of their work, and addresses to the teacher also indicated what they considered recordable material for the production of an evaluable video. This aspect ties in with the actual activity in which the students engaged during the meeting. The activities that they accomplished together represent behavior that they actually consider appropriate for meetings. Such an interpretation is based on the fact that these are activities that the participants deliberately included in, or did not erase from, the video. They ensured that their behavior was clearly visible by their references to the positioning of the camera.

Furthermore, discussion regarding the type of activity to carry out in another setting was observed. Through such a distinction of settings (meeting versus home), the interactants' reasoning regarding appropriateness of activity related to interactional space was revealed.

The instable nature of the students' interpretations of the task was also clearly demonstrated. As the meeting activity progressed, stances towards the meeting objectives were revealed, and long-term and short-term goals were negotiated. These sequences also made visible the students' orientations towards the collaborative dimension of the task. Though differing stances towards various aspects of the task were displayed at times, consensus was usually sought.

The activities mainly seen in these interactions were related to organizational themes of the meeting at hand and of the project, rehearsing or practicing the presentation script, and problem solving. These are the activities that constitute important contextual features of all the interactions analyzed in the following chapters.

Chapter 5

Doing presenting

5.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the student participants' orientations towards the requirements of the oral presentation task. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the oral presentation assignment was an ongoing activity over the course of the semester. In each class, one group presented an approximately twenty-minute lecture summary, thereby making this event a routine weekly classroom practice. Students' interactional behavior during their in-class oral presentations mainly involved unidirectional informing activity before a student audience. The audience duly gave the presenters the floor by suspending their talk and sometimes taking notes during the session. Consequently, the presenters were oriented to as experts—they were the knowing speakers, and the audience members were the un-knowing recipients of the informings. The scope of the presenters' participation status also extended to responsibilities for handling questions from the audience and the teacher. In this way they were visibly held accountable for a higher level of knowledge regarding their topic than the average audience member.

Participants' orientations towards the task requirements, or their understanding of them, could be seen in topical content and interactional conduct at various occasions throughout the video data collected during their pre-presentation meetings. These orientations were usually displayed and situated in interactions anchored in topics about certain aspects of the presentation as they emerged at some point during the meeting. In some cases the students addressed task instructions or objectives at the beginning of the task at hand and in others at the end. Many emerged during the rehearsing activity.

5.2 The oral presentation component of the project

This section analyzes data during which the students interact to address different elements of the presentation assignment related to oral performance, written content in PowerPoint slides and organization of the content presented. Each subsection presents an aspect that participants' collectively attended to, as well as the methods they used to recruit attention and action to resolve related issues.

5.2.1 Timing

The following extract makes visible the students' orientations towards completing requirements explicitly pre-established or outlined by the institution, represented

by the teacher of the course in which they were to give their presentation. Prior to this excerpt, three group members (Oscar, Tomás and Alex) have just finished the last section of their presentation practice and are now sharing post-rehearsal reflections. They make a reference to the teacher's instructions.

Extract 5-1

```
1  OSC:     it was-
2           I think it looked pretty good
3           I mean (.)
4           here in the video¿
5           it kind o:of (extends) a ↑↓lot
6           (because)
7           she said
8           the teacher said that
9           the presentation would be about
10          fifteen minutes so
11 TOM:     yes [maybe]
12 OSC:         [(xxx we)] have to:o ha- e-
13          summarize our slides [(xxx)]
14 ALE:                          [↑yeah but]
15          she also said
16          we could go over so
17          it was a minimum of fifteen minutes¿
18          [so=]
19 TOM:     [(xxx)]
20 ALE:     it wasn't
21 TOM:     was a minimum
22 ALE:     yeah there was-
23          it was not a problem
24          if we:e
25          went longer¿
26          preferably not for an hour but
27          if we went twen-=
28 TOM:     okay
29 Ale:     =for twenty minutes
30          twenty-five minutes
31          .hha i don't think it will be a problem
```

Oscar starts his turn with an assessment, which he recasts as a more hedged (*I think*) and positive assessment of the dry run of their presentation (lines 1-2). This preface adumbrates a possible dispreferred action with his use of *pretty*, which tempers the value of the presentation as being good. He initiates his next turn with an *I mean* statement, another resource projecting an upcoming dispreferred action, which in this case is a negative assessment about the length of their practice (line 5, *it kind of extends a lot*). He constructs his assessment with lexical resources (*kind of*) which serve to mitigate the dispreferred action, or negative assessment regarding the excess duration of their presentation, which may be hearable as a criticism. As an account for this assessment, Oscar refers to the instructions announced by their teacher on the subject (lines 7-10). These actions then preface his suggestion that they summarize the slides (lines 12-13.) Alex also refers to the teacher's instructions, using reported speech, as he offers a contrasting stance regarding the timing (lines 14-30). Consensus seems to be reached as Tomás

vocally utters an agreement token of *okay* (line 28) and Oscar does not offer any visible or hearable resistance.

Apart from the interactive behavior seen in this stretch of talk, the location of the reference to the institutional dimension of the oral presentation requirements are of interest. Topicalization of the teacher's instruction arose after the students' rehearsal time, or after they had carried out a rehearsal of their presentation for the first time, so the reference was connected to actions that had emerged during the meeting. In other words, the students did not mention this aspect during the interaction—or at least in the recorded version. Reference to the teacher was deployed in a proposal sequence to account for the negative assessment regarding the way the group carried out their task in terms of appropriate timing for their upcoming oral presentation.

Alex also took up the topicalization of the teacher, in the same way (with reported speech), and also used the reference to support his own assessment of his group's work—that it was appropriately done according to requirements related to time. The participants were, therefore, aligned to the use of such a reference as well as its context, though Alex initially did not initially affiliate with the propositional contents of Oscar's turn. In this case, then, an explicit reference to the teacher, or institutional representative, was invoked to support differing interpretations of an aspect of the oral presentation task.

The timing-related topic is also seen in interaction among other group members. In the extract below, group members, Laura, Rita and Gabriela check the time just after Laura has come to the end of her presentation part:

Extract 5-2

```
1  LAU:     okay
2           ((looks down))
3           well
4  GAB:     done?
5  LAU:     yes
6           ((slaps either side of her hips))
7  RIT:     (time?) okay
8  GAB:     uh
9           how many:y time
10 RIT:     nine but the first two:o
11 GAB:     okay
```

Though none of the group members explicitly refer to the teacher or the previously assigned task instructions in this extract, they orient to the temporal dimension of the oral presentation assignment. Rita requests information regarding the time in line 7, and Gabriela asks Rita for the timing of their presentation until that moment (line 8-9), after having determined that Laura has completed her part (lines 1-5). Rita responds with the amount of time, i.e. nine minutes (line 10). Both Rita's and Gabriela's request for, and Rita's supplying of this information, indicate that they

have been monitoring the timing of their performance, and they are drawing collective attention to this topic.

Gabriela's *okay* token in line 11 shows her agreement with the appropriateness of the amount of time their rehearsal has taken thus far. These actions and orientations related to constraints on the duration of this institutional task are therefore shown to be in alignment, and in turn aligned with, institutional requirements defined and also enacted in these students' classes. The topic of timing, then, makes explicit a dimension of their interpretation of the task as being related to the institutional identity, which sets requirements they must complete.

These extracts demonstrate relevant data regarding the participants' interpretations of the presentation, as well as of their orientations to the institutional constraints, through their attention to the timing requirements of the oral presentation task. Though timing was part of the pre-established instructions for the project, it did not prominently or visibly shape the students' unfolding behaviors and interaction. Displays of their orientations to this dimension emerged *in response* to the student's rehearsal activity. It did not halt the progressivity of their meeting interaction.

Reference to the topic of timing did, however, extend the participation framework of their task at hand to include other ones. It evoked a past interaction during which the teacher explicated the task criteria (particularly made visible in the first extract), and also a future one in which the duration of the presentation time is understood as needing to be appropriate. Such an allusion shapes this current meeting-time rehearsal as being tied to the participation frames in which the institution, in the form of a teacher, audience and classroom, is also a participant.

In some sequences, references or allusion to the teacher and instructions were also used to account for assessments in suggestion sequences or accounts for the immediate future actions. Some of these data will be analyzed in Part 2 of the analysis.

5.2.2 Accuracy and completeness of content presented

During these preparation meetings, students also displayed their orientations to normative expectations about presenting correct and/or complete information about orthodontic content for which they were responsible for presenting. As mentioned in the Methodology section of this thesis, part of the evaluative criteria outlined for this presentation related to students' understanding and organization of the content. Furthermore, though the presenters were positioning themselves as experts in this type of interaction, the audience had a certain level of access to the knowledge that was being explicated during the presentation. Orientations to

this type of participation framework were exhibited at various times during the meeting interactions.

In the following extract, Rita is explaining certain features of an orthodontic appliance component, elastic yarn. She interrupts her own rehearsing to comment about her insufficient knowledge regarding the use of this element.

Extract 5-3

```
1 RIT:      and then elastic yarn
2           is something a little particular about uh this¿
3           (.) ehm (.)
4           .hh what is particular about this_ (.)
5           kind of uh elastic
6           is that u:uh
            ((twelve lines omitted))
7           the good thing about it
8           is th- it doesn't mm
9           cause emergencies
10    →     which I i ↓don't know ↑why
            ((looks at Gabriela))
11          i mean if the:ey
12          they exp-
13          they
14          no
            ((looking at Laura, waving her finger from side to side))
15 LAU:     oh
16          ((laughs))
17 RIT:     if the:ey
18          they ask me why it doesn't make emergencies
19          i (.) won't know what to say
20          do you know [what to say?
21 GAB:                 [mmmmmmmm
22 RIT:     no we don't
23          okay
24          hm
            ((smiles; points to Gabriela))
25          could think about it
26          a:and
27          and a- another thing particular
28          of this technique is that
            ((continues))
```

Rita abruptly changes footing at line 10 by halting her presentation talk, or going off-script, and directing her talk to her co-participants. She announces to Laura and Gabriela that she lacks an understanding of an aspect of her topic to which she has just referred. She does not understand why elastic yarns do not cause emergencies (as seen in lines 18-19). She accounts for her sudden announcement action by evoking the future participation of their audience members. She thereby reveals her orientation to the audience's entitlement to request information about this phenomenon that eludes her, as well as to her obligation to know the answer to this question (lines 17-19).

She seeks to determine whether her co-presenters have access to this information by asking them if they know what to say (line 20). Upon confirming that neither of them can provide an answer, she suggests that they consider gaining access to this knowledge (22-25). This sequence not only indicates Rita's stance regarding their collective responsibility to manage their topic domain, but also to assume an extended knowing epistemic status in front of their non-knowing audience members. Thus, their interpretation of the oral presentation task includes being able to display an asymmetrical status, or higher level of knowledge about their subject relative to their recipients in this context. They orient to the normative expectations regarding the audience's requesting information about something – in fact, that was not part of the prepared script – and the presenter's required behavior being to provide a correct answer.

Attention to precision in presenting aspects of their epistemic domain is displayed by the participants on various occasions throughout the data. The following extract shows the interactants' stances towards the importance of accuracy in the provision of information during their presentation. In this stretch of talk, Oscar has been rehearsing his part of the presentation with Alex and Tomás. Tomás intervenes to make a suggestion about Oscar's content.

Extract 5-4

1	OSC:		then (.) eh pain
2			pain appears
3			when too much force is applied to a tooth
			((seventeen lines of Oscar's rehearsing omitted))
4			pain usually lasts for about two to four days.
5	TOM:	→	about the pain?
6			i remember the teacher said tha:at
7			>it wasn't a compulsory thing.<
8			that some patients do (.) feel pain
9			but others don't
10			like
11	OSC:		(xxx)
12	TOM:		it >depends on the force you< apply
13			and like if you can say that
14			it's >not compulsory to< feel pain
15	OSC:		(xxx)
16	TOM:		well i- i would say
17			cause sometimes people is afraid¿ (.)
18			of wearing orthodontics
19	ALE:		okay

In the extract above, Oscar is rehearsing his part about pain that orthodontic patients experience during orthodontic treatment. As he comes to the end of one of his slides, Tomás initiates a suggestion sequence starting in line 5, where he elicits attention by referring to the object of a perceived trouble. His turn displays his own, and differing, understanding of the content, namely that pain does not always occur in the situation being described.

He prefaces this understanding by referring to the explanation that was given by the students' orthodontics professor (lines 6 -9). This reference shows a stance toward the level of accuracy of the content that Oscar has presented about the occurrence of pain. Tomás further supports his suggestion by referring to the need to be precise in this aspect in lines 16-18: patients may avoid treatment because of their fear of pain. Tomás' stance toward the normative expectation to ensure that the content presented is correct is, therefore, made visible through halting Oscar's rehearsal activity to propose a more accurate way to present the information about this subtopic. His reference to the epistemic authority of their professor, who also represents the institutional position regarding this information (to which their peers also have access), and also his contextualizing of the importance of this information within the clinical context, constitute his account for presenting correct content.

Though we do not understand what Oscar said in response to Tomás' suggestion, we can see that Oscar felt it relevant to respond (in lines 11 and 15), and his turn seems to be affiliative to the extent that neither Tomás nor Alex attempt to give a further account for this suggestion action and this sequence is closed.

Students also oriented to the completeness or appropriate level of depth of the content presented. The oral presentation was to be a twenty-minute summary of a two-hour orthodontics lecture. The students had to, therefore, omit and reconfigure some of the content covered in this lecture, potentially leading to different perspectives of what elements should be left in or out. An example of these types of stances can be seen in the extract below, at the beginning of which Rita is coming to the end of her presentation part. A co-participant, Laura, suggests an addition to Rita's final turn.

Extract 5-5

```
1  RIT:     and when we h-
2           we:e
3           everythi:ing is done
4           we just finish treatment
5           we just finish whatever we (xxx)
6           and that's [it
7  LAU: →              [maybe stripping
8           or somethi:ing .nh no?
9           .eh finish the treatment is-(.)
10          #is# uh
11 RIT:     ↑i ↓don't know
12          if you don't like something
13          you just finish it
14          or or if something has been
15          mm mm
16          properly) corrected
17          then you
18          re-correct that
19          well ↑i don't know
20          just finish
```

```
21          ((furrows brow; turns to erase whiteboard))
22 LAU:     °aiyeyeye°
23          questions
            ((reading the text on the next slide))
```

In line 1-6, Rita has indicated that she is closing her rehearsing sequence. She indicates in line 6 (*and that's it*) that there is no further step in the treatment process she is describing. Laura hears a pre-closing action in Rita's turn and overlaps her talk in line 7 to suggest that there are other options to mention in addition to simply finishing. She supplies a candidate item, *stripping,* as well as indicates the possibility of further options in line 8 (*or something*).

Rita's resistance to Laura's proposal is seen in her turn (lines 11-21). She responds with a claim of insufficient knowledge, which projects disagreement in this interaction (Tsui, 1991) as she does not take up Laura's suggestion to include her candidate addition or even pursue the topic. She attempts to account for her own articulation of the information in lines 12-18, and then repeats her *I don't know* statement in line 19. She closes the topic with her turn *just finish* (line 20), a repeat of her earlier script.

These actions effectively indicate Rita's decision to maintain her content as is, and through her embodied action in line 21, where she uses facial expression and a change of body position (turning away from her recipient), she further reveals her stance regarding Laura's proposal to add, or modify, the content. Laura's understanding of Rita's orientation can be seen in her response in line 22 as she expresses an exclamation of (possibly mock) dismay, and then reads aloud the text on the next slide, *questions* (line 23), thereby moving on to the next topic.

The extracts above demonstrate students' orientations to including a correct and sufficiently thorough treatment of the content they were assigned to cover in their oral presentations. While the participants in the previous extract (5-4) seemed to reach an agreement regarding the correctness of the material with the deployment of a reference to the institutional level authority of the information, the interactants in the second group shown did not.

This sequence (Extract 5-5) does not represent the majority of the outcomes for this particular group (or other groups) in terms of occasions when students negotiated the content to include in their presentation. However, this extract does show that interpretations of how much of the information needs to be explicated can be negotiated or even disagreed about without reaching consensus. In questions regarding accuracy of information, however, consensus was reached by references to an external authority, an action that indicates the importance of presenting correct, and validatable knowledge.

5.2.3 Articulation of the content

Closely associated with the correctness of the content itself is the appropriateness of the way that the content is articulated. The oral formulation of the concepts that the students were required to present was also evaluated by the teacher, particularly as the students were to do so in an additional language, English. Orientations towards this dimension of this task are visible in the data through the topicalization of discourse construction as well as through their interactional conduct. In the next extract, the intersection between content and the associated discourse can be seen in the interactants' problem-solving activity as they search for and clarify conceptual and linguistic aspects of the material to present. Cristina, Rosa and Laia are searching for a term to describe the tooth movement, *procline*.

This lengthy extract is only one part of a very long stretch of talk during which the participants co-constructed a relatively short phrase for their slide: "*buccal direction to pro-incline and distal or mesial direction to separate or get close*".

The purpose of including such a long interaction in this section is to provide evidence of the amount of time, and therefore, value that the interactants placed in the accuracy of the content and the associated discourse.

Extract 5-6

```
1   CRI:   to buccal uhm
2   ROS:   to [incline/]
3   LAI:      [to incline/]
4   ROS:   no it's=
5   LAI:   =no incline no
6   ROS:   no
7   LAI:   it's to [go]
8   ROS:           [ehm]
9   LAI:   uh-
10  CRI:   tip [tip]
11  ROS:       [però]
                but
12          sí
            yes
13  LAI:    tip¿
14  CRI:    tip is inclinació
                  inclination
15  LAI:    sí però:ò
            yes but
16  CRI:    to proinclinate
17  LAI:    to proinclinate
18          ((nods in agreement; points with finger to screen
              and looks at ROS))
19          ((gestures with hand moving forward))
20          sí
            yes
21  ROS:    ((looks at screen))
22          but we only move the crown.
            ((moves hand forward; looks at CRI))
23          or [th root to ge-]
```

24 LAI: [we incline it.]
25 ROS: the root and the crown
26 LAI: the crown [because uh]
27 CRI: [>I think the root<]
28 of the ah# the the crown
29 if you want to move [the root/]
((gestures hand down towards ROS))
30 LAI: [the problem]
31 of removable [appliances]
32 ROS: [ah]
33 LAI: was that the [that]
34 ROS: [*això*]
that
35 LAI: we only:y-
((gestures forward with hand))
36 CRI: [yes]
37 ROS: [ye::ah]
38 CRI: we need a bracket to move the the root.
((moves hands in one direction; all look at screen))
39 s-
40 ROS: so en [uh]
41 CRI: [eh]
42 fixed appliances.
43 ROS: no *però* inclined/ no-
but
44 ah
45 CRI: yes
46 ROS: *sí sí °que és°*
yes yes it is
47 CRI: to proinclinate
48 ROS: *sí sí*
yes yes
49 CRI: to pro-inclinate
50 ROS: *sí sí*
yes yes
51 CRI: or pro-incline
52 ROS: pro-in-
53 CRI: uh can you search ((pointing to computer))
54 ROS: (inclinate)
55 ((moves to search for the word on the computer))
56 ((seventeen lines omitted))
57 ROS: to pro-incline
58 it's correct?
59 CRI: *sí*
yes
60 LAI: *però*
but
((strong hand gestures indicating that they should "wait"))
61 to buccal? to (pro-incline)?
62 it's very [repetative]
63 ROS: [no no no no]
64 LAI: hm
65 ROS: uhm
66 CRI: buccal forces
67 LAI: *sí*
yes
((typing))
68 CRI: to in to p- to incline
69 and distal or mesial_
70 ROS: not forces no
71 it's the acti- [the spring]

```
72  CRI:                    [the direction]
73  ROS:    [buccal spring to proincline/]
74  CRI:    [yes but the direction of the forces]
75          yes
76  LAI:    it's the direction of the force
77          buccal? distal? or mesial.
78  ROS:    yeah yeah but
            (( six lines omitted))
79          buccal direction to pro-incline?
80          and distal or mesial direction
81          to_
82  ROS:    ((looks at her computer for word))
83  LAI:    to separate or to [( )]
            ((typing))
84  CRI:                      [(ay )]
85          ( )
86  ROS:    ajuntar
            put together
            ((looking for word))
87  LAI:    [sí ( )]
88  ROS:    [put together]
            ((gesturing with hand to indicate "it's obvious";
            laughing))
89          okay
90  LAI:    distal or mesial ( )
91  ROS:    or get closer
92  CRI:    to join
93  ROS:    get
94  LAI:    get closer
            ((nods head))
```

We see first in this extract much interaction dedicated to problem-solving activity, which aims at finding the appropriate wording for an orthodontic concept, *proclination*. In lines 1-14 the participants collaborate in the search for the correct formulation of the more general term, *inclination*. Laia indicates that she does not agree with this word by deploying a *yes-but* formulation in line 15 (Pomerantz, 1984). Cristina responds with another candidate term, *proinclinate* (line 16), which includes the angle of type of inclination (forward movement) for which the members are searching. Laia confirms her acceptance of this word form by repeating it and using embodied actions of nodding and pointing. She re-confirms her acceptance of this choice of lexis verbally (*yes*) in line 20, this time directing her action to Rosa, who has refrained from agreement.

Rosa vocally projects her uncertainty of the term with the marker *but* (line 22) to initiate a sequence of clarification related to the conceptual understanding of the term they are attempting to define. Rosa focuses on the meaning of the content in order to determine the correct lexical formulation for the text they are constructing. On this occasion, she seeks to clarify whether the notion they are addressing includes two parts of a tooth (root and crown) or merely the crown. The other group members understand the relevance of her request for information and initiate responses to answer the question. Laia contextualizes the object of Rosa's question with their overall presentation topic, removable appliances (lines

30-35), and Cristina continues this line of reasoning in lines 36-42, indicating that other types of appliances would be indicated for moving the root (brackets, or fixed appliances). Rosa eventually comes around and displays her agreement at the end of this stretch of talk (line 46.) Nevertheless, Cristina remains unsure of this lexical construction and makes a request to Rosa to search for this term online (line 53).

When Rosa ends her search, she asks her co-participants for approval of her candidate term, pro-incline (line 57). While Cristina accepts this word choice, Laia disaffiliates with Cristina's action of approval. She initiates her turn with a contrastive discourse marker, *but* (line 60), utters the terms, *to buccal* and *to pro-incline*. She showcases the two terms side by side, both with rising intonation, to indicate her questioning of them being used together, and gives her assessment in line 62 regarding the inappropriate discourse style that using them in this context would create. She further displays her stance towards this idea by deploying marked embodied actions in the form of hand gestures and differentiated prosodic resources. Rosa's next turn in line 63 indicates that she has heard Laia's disapproval and aligns with her action by also rejecting the phrasing to which Laia has referred and criticized.

The problem solving actions resume with another candidate expression, *buccal forces*, in line 66 offered by Cristina. Laia confirms her approval and moves to type this phrase. Cristina continues with her text suggestion in line 68, but runs into more resistance from Rosa, who displays her disagreement with the inclusion of the term, *forces* (line 70). This action leads to more problem-solving regarding not only the linguistic, but also the conceptual aspect of the information they are explicating: forces, the appliance or the direction (lines 70- 78). Once they have reached agreement on the use of the word, *direction*, in this short phrase, which Laia reads aloud (line 79), they initiate a search for the translation of the word, *ajuntar*. Several options are provided on the Internet, and they collaborate to reach a decision on a term to apply (line 94).

The interaction in this extract demonstrates not only the co-participants' orientation to the importance of correct language use for concepts covered in their oral presentation, but also their understanding that the language is intertwined with the content they are responsible for explicating. By topicalizing the difference of the function and action of the appliance they are presenting (removable versus fixed), as well as the difference in concepts related to its function (force, appliance or direction), the interactants seem to show an awareness that language choice is only correct within a context of correctly applied treatment of the content. As mentioned above, this extract is only part of a much longer project (part of which was also seen in Extract 4-6) during which the participants co-constructed a short utterance related to this particular object belonging to Cristina's part. The

interactants' tenacious drive, as well as episodes of affective interaction displayed over a fairly long stretch of talk addressing correct content formatted in correctly framed discourse, ultimately revealed their interpretation of what successfully fulfilling the oral presentation task involves. That is, publicly displaying accurate information using appropriate discourse to do so.

Activity targeting correct content-specific lexical formulations could be seen in other groups' interactions. In the following extract Rita is rehearsing her part about different steps that make up a particular orthodontic treatment. She is arriving at the end of her discussion about tooth alignment when Laura overlaps Rita's final turn with an additional piece of information about this topic: an account for how alignment is achieved. Gabriela recasts the concept that Laura has articulated into an alternative, and technically accurate, lexical format.

EXTRACT 5-7

```
1 RIT:       what w- what you will get
2            is the alignment of all the teeth.
             ((turns from whiteboard))
3            that's (.) just(.)
             ((puts cap on marker))
4            what we [have to do with this
5 LAU:               [because they go to the:e
6            to the real position of the wire
7 GAB:   →   memory of shape
8 LAU:       the memory of shape
9 RIT:       oh yeah
10           because it has memory
11           okay
12           °i will say it°
13           .hhh a:and then
14           the third step is the leveling
```

After Gabriela offers a candidate packaging for the information that Laura has proposed as an addition to Rita's script (line 7), Laura confirms the correctness of this formulation by repeating it (line 8) but as a definite noun. The addition of the definite article, *the*, indicates an orientation that this element is known by the recipients (Clark & Haviland, 1977; Hutchby, 2006: 30). Rita indicates her acceptance of the wording of this concept, as well as of the initial proposal to include it in her presentation section, by confirming her agreement with an *okay* token (line 11) and announcing her commitment to saying it in the future presentation (line 12).

This interaction shows the tiered collaborative piecing of the presentation content and discourse. Laura displayed her stance regarding the incompleteness of the content by proposing an addition to the material presented by Rita. Gabriela subsequently shaped the linguistic dimension of the proffered concept by indicating an alternative formulation of the term, which the co-participants accepted as being appropriate for this context.

These extracts reveal the value the participants placed on accuracy of conceptual information and its associated language. Through the interactants' topicalization and negotiation of these aspects of their presentation product, their shared objectives targeting these dimensions were made visible to each other and to the analyst. In 5.2.6 the students' treatment of pronunciation, rather than content-specific terminology, will be addressed. In the following section, another prominent topic related to the participants' orientations toward a content-related aspect of the presentation will be analyzed: the organization of content.

5.2.4 Organization of content: spoken aspect

An important facet of developing a presentation is the organizational structure of the content being delivered. A part of the evaluative criteria of this task related to the students' competence in organizing their material in a coherent way that also highlighted the main components and discarded the detailed elements of the material, or producing a summarized version of a larger topic. The students needed to show a good understanding of the topic, as well as of summarizing practices, in order to carry out this part of the assignment together.

The next two extracts are from the first meeting among Gabriela, Rita and Laura, prior to their rehearsal meeting. This occasion was recorded a day after the orthodontics lecture for which they had to prepare their presentation. In this transcript, the students have been discussing what they should include in their presentation, and as they list the items, Laura is writing them on the whiteboard in front of which Rita and Gabriela are sitting. Rita initiates a turn in which she suggests eliminating a piece of information they had initially decided to include (the historical background). This proposal leads to a general negotiation of what they should include and why.

EXTRACT 5-8

1	RIT:	so i- i
2		now I've been thinking.
3		maybe u:uh
4		we should just erase the history part.
5	GAB:	yeah.
		((shakes head side to side; then nods))
6	LAU:	yeah
7		because they talked in the last o:one
8	RIT:	yeah
9		and it's un-
10	LAU:	and
11	RIT:	it's (un)necessary because
12	LAU:	and they talk u:uh
13		a lot about the:e the history.
14	GAB:	yeah i think Carlos did
15	RIT:	yeah
16		Cristian (last name) did such a lo:ong

```
17          speech
18          so i think we
19          we don’t (really)
20          we >we have to [(focus on) all this<
21 LAU:                    [we can name the
22          [the
23 GAB:     [(well uh)
24 LAU:     Angle
            ((name of historical figure in orthodontics))
25          for example i:in
26 GAB:     well
27 LAU:     [(last)
28 GAB:     [we have to talk about them
29 LAU:     yeah
            ((nodding))
30 GAB:     a- Andre:ew
31          is the one that invented the:e
            ((points to item on whiteboard))
32 LAU:     ((turns to look at whiteboard))
33 GAB:     straight [wire¿
34 LAU:              [straight
35 GAB:     and Angle the standard edgewise?
36          i think
37 LAU:     .hh
            ((turns to group))
38          we can [name
39 RIT:            [so we can mention them
40 LAU:     [yeah (xxx)
            ((turns to whiteboard))
41 GAB:     [yeah of course
42          but(xxx focus xx )
43 LAU:     so:o
44 RIT:     let’s uh(.)
45          just erase it (.)
46          with (.)
            ((points to eraser))
47 LAU:     ((retrieves eraser))
48 RIT:     that.
49 LAU:     ((returns to whiteboard to erase))
50 RIT:     you can put
51          if you want
52          introduction
53          <but i think
54          it’s not necessary<
55          and we will put here
            ((points to item on whiteboard))
56          o:one two and three
57 GAB:     (yeah)
58 RIT:     o:one two:o
            ((Rita and Laura looking at the whiteboard))
59 GAB:     and also on the slides we ca:an (.)
60          like u:uhm say
            ((shifts gaze away
            and upwards from others))
61          ↑we’re going to
            ((returns gaze to others))
62          talk about
63          the three ma:ain (.)
64          items
65 RIT:     [yeah.
66 LAU:     [(xxx)]
```

```
          ((nods))
67 GAB:   passive elements¿
68        the brackets.
69        the active elements¿
70        that will be our main part¿
71        and the treatment.
72        an-
73        it's really short.
74 RIT:   yes
75        [because
76 LAU:   [(yeah it's too)
77 RIT:   like
78        we have to talk
79        already fifteen minutes.
80 GAB:   yeah
81 RIT:   and we ca:an't (.)
82        (xxx)
          ((turns head away into hand))
83        ((Gabriela and Laura laugh))
84 RIT:   okay
85        next
```

Rita prefaces her suggestion to eliminate a part of their jointly-decided presentation material with a reference to her rationalization process, *I've been thinking* (line 1-2) that has led her to her proposal (line 4). Both Gabriela and Laura align to her action and affiliate to the object of her suggestion. Laura also displays her affiliation by means of an account for Rita's recommendation (line 7), because their peers talked about this topic in the last presentation (line 7). This idea is further developed and made explicit by all the participants in lines 12-17.

In line 20, Rita starts to describe what they do need to treat (rather than what not to cover), using an embodied action of pointing to the content on the whiteboard to complete her turn. Laura aligns with her action and overlaps it with a suggestion of a type of content they can include (line 21). She deploys the modal verb, *can*, and then the lexical choice, *example* (line 25) both of which indicate that her reference to Angle, a historical figure in orthodontics, is a candidate piece of information that they may consider.

Gabriela counters her suggestion (line 28) with a stance that this information is not optional (*we have to talk about them*), and extends her explanation regarding the relevance of including these items. The names to which they allude are associated with the appliances they will be presenting.

Laura accepts Gabriela's proposal (line 38) to include the names. Rita recasts the suggested action to display her orientation to the summarizing dimension of the task: to mentioning the names (line 39) rather than giving a historical explanation of them. Gabriela weakly accepts with a *yes-but* construction (line 41-42), displaying her position regarding the focus of their topic. Rita suggests, in line 44, to simply erase the content related to the history (line 45), to which Laura

complies. In line 50, Rita dictates the outline of the content to include in their presentation, one, two and three (line 56).

Until this point, the participants have discussed material they should not include, and why, as well as defined the focus of their presentation. They have carved out their niche within a larger topic, part of which was already covered by another group. Furthermore, they have made the summarizing requirement explicit by referring to concrete divisions of concepts (one, two and three).

Interestingly, at line 59, Gabriela formulates a suggested discursive style that could accompany their slides. She offers a candidate phrasing in lines 61-71, with the use of prosodic resources, or a higher pitch, to index her shift in participation frame, one in which she is delivering her part in their future presentation. Gabriela's action may have risen from their topicalization of what their presentation domain should contain and how it should be structured. She is now considering the public display of this information as she refers to the slides (line 59) and what they will be saying when the slides are shown (61-71).

Gabriela invokes the future exhibition of their decisions thus far by referring to their slides, which they have not developed at this stage of their project, and also by using quoted speech to depict herself as a future presenter. These resources make their negotiated work visible, and she assesses this organization as being (appropriately) short, or summarized (line 73). Her co-participants align and affiliate with her evaluation, and Rita supports this suggested content by referring to the presentation requirement related to timing (*we have to talk fifteen minutes*, line 79). She closes the sequence in line 84, with the token, *okay*, and shifts the topic to the next one.

This extract shows interactants' forging their topic and organization turn by turn and by contextualizing their part within a greater scope of a macro-topic whose responsibility for presenting this material is shared with other members of their class. They also orient to the type of content they should include and at the same time to the summarizing and timing aspects of their presentation task.

Previous to the extract above, this same group in the same meeting space has been reflecting on the general organization of the content and how their parts, which they have not yet been assigned to each other, would be distributed throughout the duration of the presentation.

EXTRACT 5-9

```
1 GAB:      [maybe, maybe,
2 LAU:      [a brief summary (xxx)
3 GAB:      maybe on the slides
4           but then uh presenting
5           we could
```

6 RIT: ((nods))
7 LAU: °ah°
((nods))
8 GAB: u:uh (.)
9 LAU: ah
10 RIT: ah
((gestures with hand towards Gabriela))
11 GAB: like (.)
((looks at Rita; smiles))
12 RIT: (°xxx°)
13 GAB: combinate
((furrows brow))
14 each other?
15 LAU: yeah [(xxx)
16 RIT: yeah like uh
17 [like
18 GAB: [like ehm
19 kuka-
((Kuka=nickname for Rita;
lifts hand above and in front of face, palm down))
20 u:uhm mmm
21 RIT: °Rita°
((hand in front of mouth;
pronounced with English pronunciation))
22 GAB: Rita
((laughs))
23 Rita Loly
((Loly=nick name for Laura))
24 and Gabriela
25 and °rita [loli°
26 RIT: [yeah
27 uh you- you want
28 you mean that u:uhm
29 we don't have to do it like
30 you talk five minutes
((holds hand up with index finger and thumb
seemingly indicating a section—after each "five minutes"))
31 you talk five minutes
32 GAB: [no
33 RIT: [you talk five minutes
34 no
35 like we expla:ain
((lifting hands and waving them together seemingly
to indicate "combining" parts))
36 GAB: i think that's too [much=
37 LAU: [yeah
38 [it's more dynamic
39 GAB: [=for the audience¿
40 RIT: yeah
41 LAU: it's more dynamic for the class
42 because it's very:y
43 heavy
44 GAB: yeah
45 RIT: yes.
46 LAU: so
((turns toward the whiteboard to write))
47 RIT: and then we can do more(.)
48 uh [dynamic.
49 LAU: [arcs
((writing))

In line 4, Gabriela shifts the topic from slide content to how they should present the content they have been discussing, an action to which the other interactants align. After a brief search for the word to describe the type of organization she is attempting to suggest, she uses the word, *combinate* (line 13) to conceptualize her idea of interweaving the sub-topics of their presentation. She further exemplifies this organization pattern by listing and re-listing the names of their group members, each representing a section of the presentation (lines 18-.25).

Rita affiliates with this proposal in line 26, and recasts Gabriela's proposal (lines 28-34) by alluding to an alternative presentation structure as being a contrasting and also undesired option. Gabriela shows her alignment with Rita's articulation of this idea by uttering, *no*, to this type of organization. Rita then attempts to describe Gabriela's original suggestion with embodied action, using her hands to indicate a combination of their parts (line 35).

Gabriela assesses the non-mixed structure that Rita outlined as being too much for the audience (lines 36, 39), while Laura affiliates to Gabriela's suggestion with a positive assessment in line 38 and 41: it is more *dynamic* for the class. She expands her assessment to include an account for her conclusion in line 42. She describes the alternative structure as being *too heavy*, in all likelihood a direct translation from her first language to mean dense. Both Rita and Gabriela display their agreement to this stance. Laura closes the sequence with a discourse marker, *so* (line 46) to connect her next action with the previous one (a reached consensus about part distribution) as Rita refers to the future outcome of their decision regarding organization.

The interactants in this stretch of talk evoke the future participation of the audience as something to take into account when considering the structure of a presentation. Their orientation towards the valence of being dynamic is also made visible, as well as how they can make their presentation dynamic. That is, by breaking up the content into smaller parts and changing speakers more frequently, rather than each taking five minute speaking slots.

These extracts demonstrate a decision-making process that makes visible the interactants' orientations to abstract organization and division of parts. Though each group may have interacted in different ways to carry out this task, other data taken from the students' rehearsing activity (after their individual presentation sections have been developed) also indicate students' stances toward appropriate organization of content.

A part of being able to demonstrate an understanding, or expertise, of content for which speakers are responsible in an oral presentation also involves indicating how components of an overall topic relate to one another. It also involves

packaging the content in a coherent way that anticipates the future reception of this information by the audience participants in the classroom context. Students' orientations to the need for such organization of the topic for which they were responsible were displayed during their meetings just prior to their presentations. At this time, the students are listening to each other's section for the first time. This activity affords an interactional space during which each member can monitor how their sections will be incorporated within a larger presentation, how their material will relate and fit into each other's sub-topics and also whether their script and texts are appropriately structured according to normative and individual perspectives. They are each other's first recipients, and are therefore in a dual position to not only witness how their content sections inter-relates to each other as an audience, but also to further develop this aspect of their project as co-authors.

The interaction in the following extract is a continuation of an extract shown earlier (Extract 5-4) in which Tomás had suggested a modification in Oscar's script. Once this proposal sequence has seemingly closed, Alex self-selects a turn to offer a further suggestion, which targets issues related to the organization of the presented content.

Extract 5-10

```
1  ALE:     okay
2           and i'd say
3           eh we're going too quick through the slides
4           like we there's no introduction to (.)
5           uh what is coming next
6           like Oscar in:n slide six
7           e:eh made a small comment on
8           on each section
9           he was going to explain
10          but then he
11          when he went from section to section
12          he went directly to the first point
13          in each uh# slide
14          maybe give the:e the audience
15          or #uh# the people who are listening
16          an introduction
17          which is not part of the slide
18          so they ar:re feeling that there is no reading an no-
19          there's e:eh (.) an understanding of what we're explaining
20          beyond what is in (.)
21          written in each slide
22          maybe #i-
23          it's just a feeling ma-
24          i'm getting
25 TOM:     yes
26          i- i'm fine with this (one)
27 ALE:     okay
28          so just like slower and i-
29          introduce examples or something
            (.)
30          if [you're] okay
31 TOM:        [(xxx)]
```

```
32 OSC:     after we talked about pain?
33          ehm the next slide ehm
34          talks about the source of pain.
```

Alex takes the opportunity that the pause in Oscar's rehearsing activity has provided to initiate a suggestion sequence in which he addresses the delivery and organization of their presentation content. His turn begins with the agreement token, *okay* (line 1), which effectively shows his affiliation to the previous proposal as well as to the closing of the topic (Beach, 1995). He initiates the sequence with the discourse marker, *and* (line 2) to connect his next action (*I'd say*) with the previous one, which was a suggestion about modifying an aspect of the presentation. He then introduces the topic of coherence or flow in presenting material during their public talk. He achieves this first by evaluating their rehearsing activity until this point by referring to the excessively fast pace of their presentation (lines 3) due to a lack of introductory content for each new theme or slide. He then uses a reference to Oscar's conduct as an example to support his assessment, namely that Oscar did initially give a type of introduction, or *a small comment on each section he was going to explain* (line 7-9), but later stopped doing this practice.

Alex formulates his actual proposal by explicitly outlining the action he believes to be appropriate in line 14 (*give…an introduction*). This is embedded in an account for why this style of organization is a central aspect to consider in the delivery of their presentation—for the sake of the audience, who he defines as listeners, or the ultimate recipients of their public talk. In lines 17-21 he further details the perspective of the audience regarding their own performance. He does this in terms of describing their delivery as having the capacity to project their mastery of the content being explained. He explicates that by providing an introduction, which is not on their slides, they can also demonstrate a competent level of knowledge of their subject.

When Tomás displays agreement with this suggestion in lines 25-26, Alex hears this as a go-ahead for advancing his suggestion action. He proposes the means to execute his proposal in his pre-sequence closing turn (lines 27-29): by reducing their pace and using examples. Tomás is heard to agree, and Oscar shows his alignment with this proposed future action by complying with the suggestion articulated by Alex. He introduces the next slide with a brief introduction or cohesive device in line 32-33, rather than launching directly into the topic of the next slide, *the source of pain*.

This sequence, during which consensus is reached by all members, indicates an orientation to the organization of the orally presented content, or the group members' script. Importantly here, Alex supports the need for this practice, giving

introductions before each slide, by invoking the participation framework, which includes their future audience, to whom they will be presenting. He refers to the actions of their collective recipients (the audience), who will be listening (line 15) to them and assessing the group's competence (lines 18-21). He refers to this future situation to account for why they should design their presentation in a way that does not limit their speaking to the text shown on their PowerPoint slides. The organization of discourse outside of the slide content is then, according to the stances revealed in this interaction, an important goal for the achievement of this academic task.

The attention to the importance of content organization was also noted in data of the other groups included in this study as can be seen in the following extracts.

Extract 5-11

```
1    LAI:    an anterior bite ↓↑planes .ah
2    CRI:    how many:y (.)
             ((Laia looks at Cristina))
3            plates we have.
4            (0.7) five
5    LAI:    (0.7)anterior, posterior, incli:ined¿ (1.6)
             ((listing using fingers for each "plane"))
6            a:and with lingual [(fins.)]
7    CRI:                       [yes]
8 →          s- and you can introduce (xxx)
9            we ↑ha:ave
             ((punctuates with hand gestures; looking at Laia))
10    LAI    ((nods))
11    CRI    °(and ↑fo[ur])°
12    LAI             [kay]
13    CRI    no?
14    LAI    so we ↑have
```

In Extract 5-11 Cristina interrupts Laia's rehearsing to suggest an alternative way to introduce the topic: types of appliances. She does so by using an introductory device that would refer to the number and names of the planes to which each appliance is associated. She recruits Laia's attention with a request for information about the number of plane types in lines 2-4. Laia aligns with this action by counting the planes aloud.

Once this information has been established by both Laia and herself (lines 5-7), Cristina formulates her suggestion that Laia introduce this topic by informing about the number of planes (lines 8-11), and Laia accepts and complies with the proposal. The evidence of their aligned orientations towards the importance of organization is made visible by Cristina's suggestion and Laia's immediately displayed affiliation to the proposed action.

The next extract shows a similar sequence addressing the shared goal of organizing the content in an appropriate manner. In this extract, Laura has been

rehearsing her part when Gabriela proposes a different way to sequence her material.

Extract 5-12

```
1 LAU:      of the:e
2           of the desi:ired
3           mmm base ((end of the slide))
4 GAB: →    i think-
5 LAU:      and at the oh- ((looks at Gab))
6 GAB: →    i think you should say at the
7           beginning of this part
8           that this is the:e
9           the nowadays uh
10 LAU:     ((looks down; breathes in; mildly shrugs;
            lifts hands palms upward))
11 RIT:     option
12 GAB:     option
13          so to remark that this
14          is what we do
15 RIT:     yeah
16 GAB:     nowadays (.)
17 LAU:     ((slightly lifts eyebrows))
18  →       mmm i thought that
19          when i te- e:eh ((looks at Gab))
20          when i finish to:o
21          to say that- s this part
22          .hhh ehm that the standard edgewise
23          i:im don't n didn't have the consideration
24          that the:e different teeth eh
25          the different teeth have .hh
26          eh different inclination=
            [=so
27 GAB:     [mmhmm
28 LAU:     it's an improvement
29          that it
30          that the:ey [made]
31 RIT:                 [made?]
32 GAB:     mmhmm
33 RIT:     so
34 LAU:     ((looks at Rit))
35 RIT:     that's where we use it
36          no?
37 LAU:     yeah
38          you think it's better (.)
            ((looking at Rita))
39          to say that (.) it's the most [used
```

In the extract above, Laura is rehearsing her part when Gabriela intervenes (line 4) to suggest an alternative way to organize this section of the presentation. Her formulation of the proposed restructuring of the script is in the format of an opinion about what Laura's action should be. That is, introducing her presentation part with an aspect of her topic, specifically regarding the current state of affairs of an orthodontic treatment use.

Laura is not quick to affiliate with Gabriela's proposal. She aligns with Gabriela's action by acknowledging her reference to the temporal aspect of this orthodontic

appliance use. Rather than taking up Gabriela's proposal, she gives an account about why she had arranged her content in this way starting in line 17; she refers to her reasoning process that led to the design of her script. Gabriela gives a non-committal continuer marker, *mmhmm* (line 32), and Rita does not indicate whether she agrees with Laura or not. Rather she moves to close the sequence by displaying an orientation to Laura's entitlement to maintain her script the way she had originally authored it (lines 33-36). Rita starts the pre-closing with the discourse marker, *so*, showing that her next action will be connected to the Laura's account for her text organization, and announces that they will keep (*we use*) this element of the topic (*it*) at the end of this part (*that is where*).

Laura, seemingly unsure of her organization choice alongside a lack of explicit and strong commitment displayed by her partners pursues agreement (line 38). She does so by asking whether her co-participants think taking up Gabriela's proposed ordering of concepts in her part would be a preferred action. This sequence leads to further negotiation about the organization of this particular piece of information.

The interaction in this extract shows co-participants' strong stances towards the sequencing and distribution of aspects of their topic. Gabriela displays her orientation to the priority of information arrangement by halting Laura's ongoing rehearsing activity to draw her attention to this aspect. Laura does not take up Gabriela's suggestion to re-order the information she has authored and defends her position. She does so by providing an account for her chosen structure with referral to her rationalization process.

The topicalizing of her previous thinking applied to the construction of her presentation part further reveals Laura's interpretation of what preparing a presentation topic involves. However, she also orients to the collaborative facet of developing this theme by inviting the others to make the final decision with her. Therefore, in this context, organization of content—by individuals and as a group—was treated as an important topic that requires actions of public noticing, negotiation, and consensus.

5.2.5 Organization of content: written aspect

The data shown until now has demonstrated the participants' collective treatment of the spoken aspect of their presentation. Similar orientations towards public display of their content organization can be seen in members' actions related to the written text included on their PowerPoint slides. When Rita, Laura and Gabriela were planning their overall presentation prior to the development of their PowerPoint slides and their rehearsal meeting, they had discussed this issue. In the

following extract the three group members are discussing how and when they will develop their slides, and when they will meet again to practice.

EXTRACT 5-13

```
1 LAU:      or too
2           when we (do) the slides¿
3           we ca:an
4           (put xxx)
5           we are not going to put
6           so much
7           ehm words
8 GAB:      ((nods))
9 LAU:      e:ehm in our work
10          we can put (.)
11          what the-
12          what's the important about
            ((hand gestures))
13 GAB:     yeah
14 RIT:     [ah
15 LAU:     [the:e
16 RIT:     [in the:e
            ((hand gesture displayed to trace a square—slide—in the
            air))
17 LAU:     [pictures in the
18          in the[slides.
19 GAB:           [on the slides
20          tha-
21          i think that's [very important
22 RIT:                    [in a
23          in a document apart [from that.
24 GAB:                        [i think u:uhm
25          a lot of pictures¿
26 LAU:     yeah (xxx).
27 GAB:     like
28          yeah
29 RIT:     yeah i-
30          I have all the pictures (in xxx)
31          ((Rita smiles; others laugh))
32 GAB:     (a lot) of pictures and (.)
33 RIT:     and e:ehm
            ((moves her hand, palm down, in front of her
            in a cutting motion))
34 GAB:     just just
            ((hand gesture with index nearly touching
            the thumb to indicate "small"))
35 RIT:     a few
36 GAB:     the main points.
37 RIT:     [yes
38 LAU:     [yes
39 GAB:     the important words
```

Laura initiates this sequence during which the amount of text to be included on their slides has been topicalized. To introduce her turn, she refers to the future activity of their individual work to create the slides (line 2). She starts to formulate a suggested candidate action for the development of their slide text. But she abandons this action to instead articulate what they should not do (lines 5-9) to push forward the issue she is most concerned with: number of words. Once she has

secured approval of this idea with Gabriela's embodied agreement in line 8, she extends her description to make explicit the appropriate approach to this part of the task (lines 9-12), namely, include what is important.

Gabriela and Rita align and affiliate with Laura's suggestion by means of various actions that display agreement. In particular, they all take up the topic and expand it through tiered actions to suggest other ways of minimalizing text on the slide. These include using pictures (line 17) and keeping their extended discourse in a separate document (line 23). Gabriela makes explicit a stronger stance by assessing this practice (minimizing text) as *very important* (line 21). They refer to the concept of appropriate quantity through their verbal formulations using *just* (line 34), few (line 35), *main points* and *important words* (lines 36 and 39). Their embodied actions through the use of hand gestures indicating *small* or *little* also emphasize their orientations to this behavior.

This stretch of talk demonstrated the interactants' views toward the importance of slide design in terms of appropriate amount of text to be included for their presentation. It also showed their orientations towards visual text as being only a part of displaying their presentation material as they referred to the use of an additional document (line 23) to contain the discourse that will be used for their oral delivery of the material. They also displayed this understanding by referring to images to be included on the slides (rather than text), another artifact which could appropriately support their explications. They do not explicitly state a role for the slides. But by differentiating the type of content to be included in the slides, they are manifesting their orientations to how their content is to be best *visibly* structured or displayed as part of their overall presentation structure.

A differentiation between written (on the slide) and spoken discourse is also alluded to by Alex in Extract 5-10, when he refers to the group members' being able to present material that is not included on the slide. Though he was focusing on what the oral discourse should contain, rather than that of the slide, both of these groups indicate that the slide content should be less elaborate than their scripts to present their information.

The position related to including a minimal amount of written content was made visible during a rehearsal meeting among Rosa, Laia and Cristina as well. This topic arose in an interaction after their slides had been developed, unlike the previous extract, which showed the participants' planning prior to their completing the slides. In the transcript below, Laia is about to resume her rehearsing after a brief pause to address an intervention by Cristina. Rosa makes a bid for the floor to address the amount of text that the present slide contains.

Extract 5-14

1	LAI:	*vale*
		okay
		((looking at the PowerPoint slide as CRI types))
2		[post]erior=
3	ROS: →	[but]
4	LAI:	=linga-
5	ROS: →	there are a lot of (.) letter no?
6		(0.7)
		((letter=words; looks at CRI))
7		isn't it?
		((creases forehead; squints))
8		((laughs))
9		no
10		there are?
11		aren:n't (.) they?
12		((laughs))
13	LAI:	((laughs a little; stops))
14	CRI	°*és igual*°
		°it doesn't matter°
15		((covers mouth with hand; looks at screen))
16	LAI:	*no sé*
		i don't know
17		*jo crec que:e*
		i think tha:at
18	CRI:	°no°
		((looking down))
19	LAI:	*jo ho deixeria ↓així eh*?
		i'd leave it like this eh¿
20		>posterior lingual fins.<

Rosa overlaps Laia's rehearsal sequence to draw attention to the amount of text on the current slide (line 5). She displays her disagreement about the design of the slide's text by initiating her turn with a contrastive discourse marker, *but* (line 3), waits for Rosa to acknowledge the shift in footing and gives an assessment regarding the excessive quantity of words. Rosa's turn is heard by her recipients as a proposal to change the text on the slide, presumably to reduce the amount of text, as can be seen by their responses which display a disaffiliation with Rosa's action. Neither Laia, the presenter, nor Cristina take up Rosa's suggestion.

The analysis of this sequence will be developed further in Chapter 8 For the purposes of this section, however, this extract serves to evidence the interactants' orientations to organizational issues in the visual representation of their content. Their interaction indicates perceptions regarding the volume of written text as being a relevant topic to collectively address and even one that can give rise to strong disaffiliative, or dispreferred, actions.

The data presented in the previous sections have demonstrated group members' orientations toward the organization of presentation content as being a key element of their shared task in the development of their oral presentation. These stances were made visible in one group's meeting previous to the design of their

slides. They were also seen emerging in post-PowerPoint production activity during which the presentation was the focus of attention.

Participants initiated interventions during co-interactants' rehearsals to recruit attention to the order of which the content items were being presented or to the visual display or composition of the slide content. This was accomplished by various means. Group members provided accounts for the need of alternative arrangement of the content components and used various resources to formulate their suggestions for other formatting options.

The students also articulated preferences towards organizational styles, and in three cases they made proposals regarding introductory devices and provided candidate articulations for these introductions. Thus, they reveal their own access to, and perspective of, presentation content that was not initially assigned to them, as a domain for which they were all responsible.

In these extracts, interactants do not display disagreement about the accuracy or relevance of the content itself. This suggests that they share similar understandings of the information and what constitutes the essence of the conceptual material to be included. However, the fact that co-presenters interact to display their perspectives regarding the arrangement or order of the material to be explained manifests orientations towards: 1) the importance of how and in what order content should be made public in this context; and also 2) that alternate options to do so exist.

These orientations are highlighted in the responses of the suggestion recipients. We see an uptake of the proposal to present the content in a different way in Extract 5-11. In contrast, no such proposal acceptance occurred in the interaction seen in Extract 5-12. The speaker in Extract 5-12, Laura, defended her own organization. In fact, this sequence is followed by a long stretch of talk dedicated to the suggestion put forth by Laura's co-participant (see Chapter 8, Extract 8-6), but her original script was ultimately not modified.

In Extract 5-14, there was visible resistance towards Rosa's proposal, and the sequence was closed in a fairly abrupt and uncooperative manner. In other words, the importance the participants placed in the composition of the presented content was manifested in their commitment to this topic. This was done either over a fairly long project during which members sought to convince each other of their own preferred script formulations, or short and disaffiliative turns.

5.2.6 Pronunciation of presentation material

This presentation project forms part of an ICLHE course, which not also focuses on discipline-specific content, but also associated professional discourse and terminology, such as that used in conferences and journals. Therefore, another evaluative criterion for the oral presentation assignment was related to various language-related aspects. Part of the students' attention was paid to the grammatical, lexical and phonological dimensions of this oral presentation project.

As seen in earlier extracts, students endeavored to shape and express their content in appropriately technical and academic formulations. They also focused on general structural aspects of their text and scripts. A particularly frequent emerging topic was related to correct pronunciation. This is not unexpected as the participants were preparing for a presentation to be delivered in an additional language. As mentioned above, this meeting constituted a dry run of their upcoming presentation, so that orientations toward the relevance of correct pronunciation were frequently visible throughout their meeting event. Some examples of these types of sequences are included below.

In a continuation of Extract 5-1, which occurs immediately after the rehearsal of their full presentation, Alex, Oscar and Tomás have been reflecting on their performance; Alex then shifts the topic to the issue of pronunciation.

Extract 5-15

```
1 ALE:      i'll just (.)
2           s- >comment on a thing<
3  →        i think we have to work on
4           on pronounciation of some words
5           we commented (and they)
6           cause they are quite tricky
7           .hh and then here
8           it's a a little bit difficult to see
9           cause we:e
10          we don't have a full body (.) image
11          but (.) maybe like body language and gestures
12 TOM:     [yeah
13 OSC:     [yeah
14 ALE:     use them a little
15          when we do the presentation¿ (.)
16 OSC:     [mmhmm]
17 TOM:     [yes] and practice (.) it a bit
18          like (.) what you said we:e (.)
19          explain all the words like pronunciation
20          and then like repeating the:e (.)
21 OSC:     yeah and if [you:u
22 TOM:                 [(xxx)]
23          (xxx) >a little bit<
24          like i don't know like
25          like say- saying them (to) the mirror
26          or whatever
27 ALE:     okay [okay]
```

```
28 TOM:          [or to] like (.)go faster
29          and like explain to
30          to the class
31          [#u:uh#]
32 ALE:     [okay]
33 TOM:     they can understand better perfectly
34 ALE:     okay
35 OSC:     and if you:u mispronounce a word¿
36          .h e:ehm just pronounce it again properly
37          and that's it
38          (it don't)uh- mm
39 TOM:     [yeah
40 OSC:     [you don't have to (be) nervous
41 ALE:     yeah i think as-
42          as long as we:e
43          correct the pronounciation
44          on the spot
45          i think it will be okay
```

All of the participants orient to this post-rehearsal interactional space as a relevant time to identify and evaluate areas of their presentation that require more attention, and also suggest means for improving their performance. These reflections and proposals reveal their orientations to normative expectations of this task. In this extract they mainly topicalize aspects of pronunciation.

Alex introduces the topic by suggesting that they dedicate time to pronunciation practice (lines 3-5) and accounts for this need by referring to the words' level of difficulty (line 6). Though he initiates another suggestion related to body language (lines 7-15), the other participants opt to expand his suggestion action related to further pronunciation work. Tomás returns to the pronunciation topic in line 17 and refers to Alex's earlier turn regarding this element (*like what you said*). He proffers a suggestion over several turns (lines 19-26) about how to improve their pronunciation by repeating and saying the words to a mirror. He also accounts for why pronunciation is necessary (line 28-33); he refers to their future audience to whom they will be able to *speak faster* and *explain* and they will be able to *understand better perfectly*. He alludes to the recipiency of their audience to support the importance of correct pronunciation.

Oscar aligns with this topic and suggestion activity (lines 35-40) as he extends the pronunciation theme to suggest a type of behavior in the event that they mispronounce a work during their presentation. Here he displays his orientation to what appropriate public speaking behavior is. Namely, it means not to appear nervous—especially in light of the possibility of making a pronunciation error. Alex aligns and affiliates with Oscar's proposal (lines 41-45) by outlining a proposed conduct in handling a mispronunciation event for their pubic speaking (*correct the pronunciation on the spot*).

This extract shows members' orientations to the importance of correctly pronouncing terminology in their content during the presentation. They also refer

to various contexts during which attention to pronunciation practice is advised. These references include allusions to their performance together during their just-completed rehearsal, to future contexts in which each member practices on their own (in front of a mirror), and also to another rehearsal together just before their presentation. All of these contexts are conjured to indicate activity that will better prepare them for this feature of their performance. Such references also connect future activities, and ultimately the oral presentation event, to their current interactional behaviors as well as to those considered for the near future. Therefore, practice of pronunciation is a relevant conduct for any occasion that is connected to this assignment.

Concern for pronunciation was articulated in the previous extract after the participants had completed their rehearsing. However, most of the group members in the present study's data, including these same group members, oriented to producing correct pronunciation during their rehearsals. Drawing attention to pronunciation issues usually took place shortly after the perceived mispronunciation had occurred.

The next extract shows Oscar, Alex and Tomás addressing pronunciation issues while Tomás is rehearsing his part. Tomás begins a new slide in line 7, and Oscar makes a bid for the floor (line 10) to initiate a sequence to correct a mispronunciation of *latex*, which Tomás had mispronounced earlier in line 1.

Extract 5-16

```
1 TOM:      we don't use latex gloves anymore ((lɑtɛks))
2           unless it's uh surgery
3           uhm and the most common thing you'll find
4           is the general-
5           uh generalized erythema
6           ((five lines omitted))
7           okay
8           if it's on the pulp
9           the first thing to know is[that]
10 OSC: →                                 [(xxx)]
11 TOM:     (xxx) minimal
12 OSC: →   have a little
13          i have a little comment to make
14          i looked up how to pronounce ehm:m
15          the word erythema ((ɛrɪθɪmə))
16 TOM:     mmhmm?
17 OSC:     it's pronounced
18          <erythema> ((ɛrɪθɪmə))
19 TOM:     erythema ((ɛrɪθɪmə))
20          okay
21 ALE:     and eh latex ((lɑtɛks))
22          i think is latex ((letɛks))
23 OSC:     °latex° ((letɛks))
24 TOM:     latex? ((letɛks))
25 ALE:     yea-
26 TOM:     okay
27          (xxxx)
```

```
28 ALE:     exactly
29 TOM:     okay so:o
```

Oscar does not immediately correct Tomás when he mispronounces the term, *erythema* (line 5) but waits until the end of the slide topic before he first prefaces his correction sequence with an announcement of his action (lines 10-13), making a comment. He refers to an outside authority that he has consulted for the pronunciation of the technical term, but waits for Tomás to verbalize his alignment with Oscar's projected correction.

Once Tomás invites Oscar to continue his correction sequence (line 16), Oscar informs him how of how the trouble word is pronounced (lines17-18). He refers to an outside source of information and also uses the passive form to package the 'official' pronunciation, rather than offer his own concoction. Tomás shows his affiliation with this action by repeating Oscar's pronunciation of the word and stating an agreement token.

Alex expands this correction activity by pointing out another pronunciation error that Tomás had made in line 1 of *latex*. Both co-participants respond to Alex's action with Oscar repeating the word in a quiet, or private speech (McCafferty, 1994) in line 23, and Tomás requesting confirmation of his own modified pronunciation of the term in line 24. Alex confirms that the pronunciation is now correct, and Tomás displays his acceptance of the correction activity in line 26 and also line 29, after which be resumes his rehearsing.

This extract shows congruence among all of the participants' orientations regarding the importance of correct pronunciation during the presenting activity itself, whether for the task at hand, or in preparation for the class presentation. It also demonstrates a mutual understanding in regards to doing correcting pronunciation. All members align and affiliate with actions that draw attention to pronunciation issues and the need for pronouncing terms in a normatively appropriate way. Oscar refers to an outside source and also to a general truth about how *erythema* is pronounced. He does so by packaging his utterance in the present simple format and using the passive voice to show the 'general' usage for the word. There is no negotiation regarding stances about the best way to pronounce the word—they orient to the idea that there is *one* correct manner that these terms are pronounced.

Further indication of their orientations regarding correct pronunciation as being a component of this institutional task, or even a part of this educational context, is seen in Oscar's and Tomás' engagement in practicing the pronunciations. This word is not part of the material that Oscar will be presenting, yet he repeats the word Alex has introduced as the correct way to say it.

Tomás practices pronouncing the words his co-participants have modeled for him and invites Alex to confirm his pronunciation attempt in line 24. Alex assesses Tomás pronunciation as being precise (*exactly*), before Tomás initiates the closing of this sequence. Therefore, the stances that these participants display over the course of these actions indicate that monitoring, correcting, and practicing correct pronunciation constitute a part of this meeting activity.

All of the data for the groups included in this study showed several similar sequences that unfolded in the course of their meetings. In the following excerpt, Rita launches a pronunciation correction sequence as Laura comes to an end of one of the subtopics of her presentation.

Extract 5-17

```
1  LAU:     an:nd on the cervical((θərvɪkəl)) incisal
2           e:eh position
3           ((thirteen lines omitted))
4           so at the end of the treatment
5           wha:at we want
6           is the:e
7           (the xxxx)
8           [u:uh]
9  RIT:     [xxx]
10 LAU:     now we notice¿
11 RIT:     je-
12          >just one thing<
13    →     when you say
14          th- cervical
15          don't say θərvɪkəl
16          (like you say)
17 LAU:     cervical
18 RIT:     okay cervical ssss
19 LAU:     [cervical]
20 RIT:     [the th:h] doesn't [exist]
21 LAU:                        [(thank you)]
22 RIT:     change? ((the PPt slide))
```

This extract demonstrates a correction well after the pronunciation trouble has emerged (in line 1). Rita waits until Laura has finished a section of her presentation part, and then attempts to recruit her attention in line 9 and 11. Once Laura gives her the floor, she prefaces her correction with a reference to a source of trouble, or *thing* (line 12). She mitigates her action with the phrase, *just one*, indicating that the rest of Laura's presentation has been appropriate, and that, only one *thing* represents the weakest version of trouble in terms of quantity.

Rita refers to Laura's speaking action (*when you say*, line 13) using the present simple. This indicates that she is orienting to Laura's general usage of the term (*cervical*). She then deploys a bald command (line 15), formulating this directive with a negative imperative form (*don't say*), to draw attention to the mispronunciation of the term. This sequence serves to showcase the contrast between the pronunciations (appropriate in line 14 and inappropriate in line 15).

In line 16, Rita connects the mispronunciation to Laura's behavior. In lines 18 and 20 Rita further indicates the specific source of trouble in the mispronunciation—the 's' sound of the first letter of the word(c). She gives an account regarding why Laura's pronunciation is incorrect in line 20: Laura's pronunciation of cervical using the '*th*' phoneme does not exist.

Laura displays her alignment and affiliation with Rita's actions by repeating the corrected pronunciation of the word (line 17 and 19), and also by actually thanking her (line 21) for her intervention.

This correction sequence contrasts somewhat with Extract 5-16 in the level of directness of the correcting actions. Rita weakens her actions slightly with the use of a *just* token and a pre-correction turn. However, she uses an imperative form to refer to the action Laura should not perform and also elaborates on the correction (lines 18 and 20) after Laura has attempted to pronounce the word correctly. Rita invokes the general usage of the word (line 20) as an outside authority rather than a type of reference work, compendium or known expert. Furthermore, it is Rita who manages this sequence and ultimately closes it in line 22, by seeking confirmation from Laura that she should move on to the next slide.

In this sequence, Rita has positioned herself as an expert in a linguistic aspect of Laura's talk. Laura's compliance and cooperation with Rita's actions indicate not only her stance that appropriate pronunciation is important, but that it is a correctable. It also shows that her co-participant is in a higher epistemic position to be able to perform this action.

In the following extract, the correction action is initiated in a cursory manner, and leads to involvement of all the participants. Rosa is presenting her content when Laia (line 4) repeats the final word of Rosa's turn, but with a different pronunciation.

Extract 5-18

```
1   ROS:    cause its avoids
2           the dental contac between arcos.
                                    arches
3           ((hands near and on either side of jaw
            moving thumb and fingers towards each other))
4   LAI: →  (°arcas° /arkəs/)
            ((looking at the computer screen))
5   ROS:    arcs
            ((looks at Cristina))
6   CRI:    arches
            ((looks at Rosa))
7   ROS:    arkis? archis?
8   CRI:    arches
9   ROS:    between arches
10  CRI:    arc¿ (arche) ((gazes in the distance; thinking expression))
11  LAI:    ((mouths the word arches))
```

```
12          dental [arches]
13  ROS:            [°arches°]
14  LAI:    °sí°
             yes
15          ((all look at screen))
16  ROS:    [limitation?]
            ((continuing her part))
```

In a low volume and without directing her gaze at Rosa, Laia utters another version of Rosa's pronunciation of the term, *arches* (line 4). Rosa receipts this action (line 5) possibly as a correction action, as she stops her turn and repeats the word in an attempt to modify her pronunciation. She appeals to Cristina by gazing towards her, and Cristina pronounces the word (line 6). Rosa tries to imitate (line 7) Cristina's contribution, but the use of prosodic resources in the form of rising intonation displays uncertainty about her candidate pronunciations, as well as a seeking of confirmation or assistance regarding this endeavor. Cristina shows her understanding of Rosa's action by modeling the word again in line 8. Rosa then repeats the word, embedding it in the phrase from her script (line 9).

Each of the participants continues practicing this term in lines 10-13. In line 13, Rosa's final repetition is uttered in a lower volume, and Laia confirms, also in a lower volume (line 14), Rosa's pronunciation try.

Unlike in interactions seen in the other extracts, in this correction sequence, there are no prefacing or any type of mitigation resources deployed. All the turns are constructed with one or two words and heavily rely on prosodic resources to display meaning. All of the participants engage in a search for the correct pronunciation by means of uttering the word aloud in attempts to reach an appropriate version. There is also no reference to an outside authority regarding the correctness of candidate pronunciations.

The actions in this excerpt indicate the participants' stance towards the importance of correct pronunciation through their alignment to Laia's correction moves with a collective search for a correct pronunciation. Their interactional behavior also demonstrates orientations about how to approach the solving of the problem: through their talk. By sounding out the problem word, they display a chosen means to access the knowledge they need regarding the pronunciation issue. In this sequence, the participants did not use other references to find their answer.

Laia's identity as the expert in this situation unfolds throughout the course of this project, starting with her drawing attention to Rosa's mispronunciation by repeating the word, *arches*, in a modified version. She pursues acceptance of her proposed pronunciation by using prosodic resources (louder volume) to affirm the correctness of her candidate as well as her verbal confirmation, *yes* (line 14). This

turn also closes the correction sequence. Through these actions, Laia's manages this project and thereby positions herself as the expert. The others' acceptance of her version is seen in the abandonment of their search and their shift to their next action as seen in Rosa's announcement of the title of the next slide (line 16).

The focus here is to show the interactants' explicit attention dedicated to the correctness of pronunciation as a part of their interpretation of what presentation preparation process entails. Their stances were made explicit by their discussion of pronunciation needs in general after their entire rehearsal (Extract 5-15), or during their rehearsal activity as mispronunciations emerged. The openings of some of these sequences were sometimes prefaced and mitigating resources were deployed at times to introduce the topic. Despite this treatment of these actions as delicates, the recipients tended to align and affiliate with the correcting actions. They did so by repeating the correct pronunciations demonstrated, showing acceptance of a candidate pronunciation, the one provided by the corrector, and resuming the overall ongoing activity. Compared to other sequences, pronunciation correction sequences were fairly rapidly resolved in few turns.

5.2.7 Oral delivery

Another dimension of the oral presentation evaluation is related to delivery, or public speaking skills. Consideration of the delivery aspect of presenting requires conceptualization of recipiency. Some of the data shown above (Extracts 5-3, 5-9 and 5-15) have revealed orientations to the participation of their future audience, or later recipients of the students' presentations. References to the audience's being able to understand the speakers, follow their discussion and also witness the presenters' expertise of the content defined as not depending on the PowerPoint slide texts were made explicit in these interactions. Along those same lines, some students also addressed the issue of competence in presenting material without reading the written version of their script.

The following extract is taken from Rita's, Gabriela's and Laura's first pre-presentation meeting, which took place after the lecture they were responsible for summarizing and when the students met to plan their PowerPoint slide presentation and divide the material into parts. The participants have been discussing the design of their slides, and have decided that their slides should only contain the *main points* and *important words*. Rita then initiates a turn to address the delivery of their content.

EXTRACT 5-19

```
1 RIT:      tch yes
2           but u:uh
3           ↑↓ oh
4           when we ↑are pre↓sen↑ting
```

```
5    →      let's not just (.)
6           read
7           no
8 GAB:      [>no no no no no<
9 RIT:      [(xx)we have to
10          [study [it¿
11 LAU:     [no no
12          that's why:y we
13          we are not going to put a lot (.)
14 RIT:     ((nodding))
15 GAB:     letter [(in it)
16 RIT:            [mmhmm
```

Rita refers to their future presentation in line 4 and suggests that at that time they not simply read their scripts. Her strongly stressed *no*-discourse marker, (line 7) indicates her stance towards this practice. Her moral position regarding reading in this context is further indexed with the declaration (line 9-10) *we have to study* it—alluding presumably to the content they must present. This utterance is grammatically packaged to display obligation for carrying out the action she is proposing.

Gabriela and Laura both immediately align with Rita's near command to study their scripts in order to prevent a need to read during the presentation. This alignment can be seen in lines 8 and 11 with their repetitive *no*-tokens. Gabriela emphasizes her affiliation with the content of Rita's proposal by speeding her utterance. Laura alludes to this stance towards public speaking as being the underlying reason for jointly reached decision to include little text in their slides (lines 12-15).

This orientation is sustained over these students' interactions. In the next extract, these same three participants are reunited for their second pre-presentation meeting. Gabriela is rehearsing her presentation part. She is visibly referring to and eventually reading her notes while speaking. Her co-presenter, Rita, intervenes to ask her about this practice.

Extract 5-20

```
1 GAB:      ((looking down at notes))
2           the elgilloy¿
3           is a:a
4           is:s(.) a wire that
5           it's not u:uhm
6           so used
7           but uh the interesting eh property
8           ((bends down))
9           is tha:at
10          ((straightens, continues to look down))
11          it's more resistant to oxidation¿
12          and can sta-
13          ((looks up))
14          and can-
15          can stand heat treatment.
```

```
16 RIT: →   .hhh will you be ↓↑reading?
17 GAB:     no
18 RIT:     the presentation?
19 GAB:     ((shakes head from side to side "no"))
20 RIT:     okay
21 GAB:     ((looking up))
22          and the:::e↑e
23          the nickel titanium
24          is the most used in orthodontics
25          ((continues to look up or avoid looking down at notes))
```

In lines 1 through 15, Gabriela can be seen as being dependent on her notes while she rehearses her part; her gaze is mostly directed downward, where her notes are lying on the desk. There is perturbation of her speech while delivering her material, such as stretched words, (lines 3, 9), a filler, *u:uhm* (line 5), and cut offs (lines 12 , 14). When she arrives at a transition relevance place (TRP), or end of her sentence in line 15, Rita initiates a request for information in the form of an interrogative, *will you be reading*?

Besides formulating her turn as a question, the accompanying prosodic contour deployed projects a stance that Gabriela is engaged in an unexpected conduct related to her delivery. She is reading rather than speaking independently of her notes. She also uses the future tense, which ties this current conduct to their upcoming performance.

Gabriela aligns with Rita's action by halting her speaking to respond to Rita's turn. She indicates that she will not read during the presentation both vocally (*no* in line 17) and with an embodied action (shaking her head from side to side in line19), and Rita responds positively to Gabriela's actions with an agreement token, *okay* (line 20) which closes this sequence. Gabriela further demonstrates her own affiliation with the stance that she should not read while she is presenting, by changing her presenting behavior. She continues her rehearsing without looking down at her notes.

This extract reveals the participants' orientations towards presenters' actions while speaking publicly in this type of context. Rita projected a fairly strong moral stance in her question making about Gabriela's actions as well as her approval of Gabriela's agreement. It also shows their orientation to the objective of the task at hand. That is, rehearsal during this meeting is a place for collaborative achievement of activity aimed at emulating ideal behavior, or the conduct that is normatively expected for the future presentation.

Thus, in this sequence interactants explicitly showed their interpretation of: 1) how they should rehearse, which is related to; 2) how they should present in the future; and also 3) how they should interact during the task at hand. In other

words, during this meeting time, they should practice doing their presentation, and the practice entails doing it the way they think it should be done during the 'real thing'.

Their conduct further indicates their orientation to the type of participation expected in a rehearsal context; this interaction showed a co-member's monitoring and giving feedback on another's performance. This type of action was peculiar to the meeting data as no such practices arose during any of the final class presentations.

Orientations regarding speaking behavior similar to these can be seen within the interaction of another group. Prior to this interaction, Rosa had suggested that during this meeting the group members should interact in a more 'conversational' way, rather than the manner in which Laia was reading her part. Rosa's proposal was not taken up by the other two members, Laia and Cristina. However, when it was Rosa's turn to present her material, she visibly demonstrated the type of behavior she had encouraged previously. This can be seen in her embodied actions described in the extract below.

Extract 5-21

```
1 ROS:      ehm retainers.
2           ((moves seat closer to the computer;
3             sits up))
4 LAI:      (xxx)
5           ((Laia and Cristina smile; Rosa laughs))
6 ROS:      to keep a the
            ((gazes at camera))
7           dental plate on his place
8           there are two
            ((looks at camera))
9           uh retainers.
            ((gestures with 2 fingers to list))
10          the adam's anchorage¿
            ((looks at camera))
11          eh we use it in
            ((looks at camera))
12          permana:a-
13          permanent molars¿
            ((looks at camera))
15          and they have a:a
            ((looks at camera; hand gestures to depict the shape))
13          crown shape.
```

Rosa's conduct is markedly different from the delivery that Laia had given during her rehearsing until this moment. Rosa positions herself to face the camera, continually turns her gaze to the camera. She uses hand gestures at the level of the camera to accompany the concepts she is introducing. These practices differ from Laia's, who read her part without looking away from the screen during her entire rehearsal activity.

Rosa's behavior is in line with the interaction type for which she had explicitly advocated and outlined in her earlier turns (*like a conversation*). Her actions indicate that this form of interaction involves eye contact with her recipient—in this case the camera, or the teacher (to whom she had previously addressed by name while gazing at the camera). It also means deploying hand gestures as part of her explanation of the material she is presenting, actions that are also directed at the camera.

These two extracts, as well as Extract 5-10 which also referred to not restricting talk to written text (displayed on the slide), make apparent the students' understanding that the delivery of their content forms a relevant part of the presentation task, whether this issue be treated during their rehearsal activity—a representation of their final performance—or alluded to as an expected norm for their future performance.

5.3 Discussion

This section has provided evidence of different aspects to which students oriented in regards to co-constructing and preparing for an oral presentation about a topic in their discipline for a course in their university program. Various aspects were topicalized and treated during their meetings. These included: 1) the timing of the presentation, which also made visible students' orientation to the institutional dimension of the task requirements; 2) accuracy and completeness of the information; 3) the organization and articulation of the content presented; 4) pronunciation issues; and 5) the oral delivery of their material.

These sequences were situated within an interactional space during which the participants organized, rehearsed and also re-structured or modified the text that had been previously developed. Attention to these aspects mainly emerged throughout the rehearsing activity and as the object of attention occurred; in other words, these actions were not predetermined. They were collectively addressed and managed as they unfolded turn by turn during this preparation event.

The evolving nature of this interaction, and the coordinated actions arising throughout these meetings, then, elucidate the participants' candid stances regarding the make-up of an acceptable oral presentation. Their interpretations of appropriate behavior involved in doing presenting are not only visible, but are collaboratively developed. Identifying the students' shared and negotiated perceptions of oral presentation criteria ties in with their ideas regarding the objectives for the meeting being recorded, or the task at hand.

These extracts also demonstrated that explicitly addressing certain issues related to producing an acceptable oral presentation in this academic setting was

considered a legitimate action in these interactants' pre-presentation meeting. None of the participants resisted or ignored the proposals that emerged during these events. Where there was disagreement, references to an outside authority were sometimes deployed. This was the case in Extract 5-1, where disagreement about timing was resolved by making explicit their understandings of the teacher's instructions.

Where there was agreement, in particular regarding the importance of good pronunciation, all group members showed alignment and affiliation through accounts for why it was important to them. In so doing, they often referred to the future participation of their audience, ways to improve their pronunciations, and also appropriate conduct during the presentation.

As mentioned in Section 5.2.1, the students sometimes referred to institutional expectations to support their stances regarding criteria for acceptable oral presentation work or to resolve issues related to perceived problems. However, much of the content and conduct seen in these interactions project orientations towards positions about appropriate performance as being their own. They position themselves as experts in oral presentation creators. They made their own perceptions explicit regarding what they deem important when assuming the role of a good presenter, or public speaker.

Ownership of such stances is made visible by engagement in activity, during which interactants refer to their reasoning, evaluations and actions related to ideal behavior. They do so by referring to themselves, such as in the utterance *I would say* (line 16, Extract 5-4), where Tomás is referring specifically to his own idea. Another example is the suggestion that Rita initiates in Extract 5-8 (line 1-4). In this sequence she proposes an action and refers to herself as the agent who defines the suggested behavior as appropriate (*I've been thinking…we should*…). Laia displayed her agency when she assessed the wording the group had jointly constructed, as seen in line 62 of Extract 5-5 (*It's very repetitive*).

Suggestion activity will be analyzed in Chapters 8-9 However, for the purposes of this chapter, behavior related to proposal making has served to demonstrate the students' positioning as owners of the tasks. They did not simply interpret the task of developing an oral presentation as merely fulfilling criteria that they understood the teacher to require. In fact, allusions to the teacher or the institution usually emerged when contrasting ideas for achieving their shared goals were made explicit.

Chapter 6

Rights and responsibilities

6.1 Introduction

As alluded to in Chapter 5, Chapter 6 provides an analysis of students' orientations towards their responsibilities and rights associated with emerging group member identities.

This chapter is divided into six main sections. Section 6.2 analyzes interaction during which students negotiated the structure of the presentation content and distributed it among themselves prior to their developing it. Section 6.3 demonstrates the fluidity of interpretations related to part distribution. Orientations displayed towards the relationship between the designated presentation parts and their authors/presenters and co-presenters are analyzed in Section 6.4. Section 6.5 provides a study of the obligations and rights that interactants associated with the status of presentation part 'ownership'. In Section 6.6, the general findings of Chapter 6 are discussed.

One of the requirements for the oral presentation project described in this study was related to the distribution of parts over the presentation of students' lecture summaries. Each group member was expected to introduce and explain at least one subtopic in speaking slots that were fairly equal in length during the presentation. Responsibilities related to division and assignment of the presentation content, however, were left to the group members themselves to carry out.

Generally speaking, the material that each student discussed during the presentation was considered and evaluated as a representation of his or her own development and understanding of the content presented. Preparation of these allocated sections entailed re-organizing or retooling subtopics of the content delivered in the orthodontics lecture for which they were responsible for summarizing, and also translating or expressing in English. The information presented was to be made publicly available to the classroom audience through PowerPoint slides and the oral script the student had authored. These artifacts were also the main means by which students were expected to display their expertise of the area for which they were responsible.

Over the process of distributing presentation 'parts', their development and final presentation thereof, arose a relationship between the presenters and the area of knowledge for which they were responsible. Though each of these defined

domains constituted one segment of a whole topic and overall project, they were explicitly negotiated and jointly delineated within a bounded territory of information. These processes incurred a certain level of commitment, responsibility and finally, expertise in each member. The resulting status, in turn, bestowed certain associated rights.

Orientations towards entitlement and obligations associated with the presenters' status as owners of their presentation topics were displayed throughout the interactions emerging in the students' pre-presentation meetings. Stances toward the definition of a part, as well as how these sub-topics should be distributed, can be seen by an analysis of the interaction and propositional content formulated in the interaction among the group members. These phenomena are present at various stages of preparation for their oral presentations, and therefore, the video data in this study was taken from interaction at different stages in the development of this task. Data shows students interacting in meetings before and during which presentation parts were distributed. Students also provided videos of meetings after the parts were individually worked up and during which they were rehearsed together.

6.2 Assigning parts

Prior to the actual creation of each group member's presentation sections, the students carried out other tasks leading up to the distribution of the parts and general workload. Among these tasks were attending their assigned Orthodontics 3 lecture and scheduling meeting dates. In the meetings, the group members needed to decide on what material should be covered in the presentation—teasing out and highlighting the essential aspects of the content. They also needed to divide the material into subtopics in order to assign them to each group member. Students were to share decision-making responsibilities about PowerPoint slide design and storage.

The students also tended to produce their own slides and scripts for subtopics they were allotted within overall collective presentation, rather than develop them collectively. Some of the video data showed students topicalizing and negotiating the organization of their future actions related to the project tasks.

The following extract (6-1) is a continuation of interaction that was seen in Extract 5-8 of Chapter 5. In Extract 6-1 the students, Laura, Rita and Gabriela, are negotiating the procedure involved in the construction of their future PowerPoint slides. They have just decided how they would like to distribute their parts across the overall presentation (multiple and alternating short parts over the course of the presentation rather than each having one, long part). They have also made

decisions about how to design their slides. They are now in the process of establishing a timeline for the completion of their slides before the next meeting.

EXTRACT 6-1

```
1  LAU:     so
2  RIT:     how are we going [to:o
3  LAU:                      [so we have
4           [to:o
5  GAB:     [this
6           this weekend
7           we can do the slides¿
8           okay?
9  LAU:     yes
10 GAB:     i think it's easier
11          if
12          if we don't u:uh
13          combine ourselves?
14          like u:[uhm
15 RIT:            [yeah
16 LAU:            [yeah
17          [(xxx)
18 GAB:     [(one does) the first pa:art [the other
19 LAU:                                  [to make the slides no.
20 GAB:     yeah
21          >i think it's not necessary.<
22 LAU:     so
23          u:um
24          [i ca:an
25 RIT:     [(xxx)
26          ((waves to the whiteboard))
27 LAU:     ((turns to whiteboard))
28          i can make the slides abo:ut (.)
29          the passive elements¿
30 GAB:     mmhmm
31 LAU:     u:um
32 GAB:     [but not the (xxx)
33 RIT:     [((opens mouth to speak))
34          yeah it will be long
35          ((creasing eyes))
36          I think
37          for just one person
38          [or yeah yes
39          ((sits up; moves forward))
40 GAB:     [.hhh (i think)
41 RIT:     this
42          ((taps on item on white board))
43          for example
44          you
            ((looks at and points to Laura))
45 GAB:     yes
46 LAU:     yes
47 GAB:     another one (.)
            ((leans forward; points to white board))
48          that with [arch
49 RIT:               [the arches
50 LAU:     so
51 GAB:     and then the other one
52 LAU:     for me?
            ((writing on the whiteboard))
53 RIT:     ((looks at Laura; smiles))
```

write it in red please.
LAU: ↑↓oka:ay
((goes to get the red marker))
((all laugh))
RIT: ((gets up, takes the eraser,
turns to erase something on the whiteboard))
(i love you)
LAU: okay so
i do the passive elements.
((writing on WB))
RIT: mmhmm
((looks at Laura))
(xxx)
GAB: tch
((lifts hand to point at WB))
LAU: okay
((puts cap on marker))
we do the passive elements
((laughs))
GAB: okay
u:uhm
LAU: so the arches about the active elements
((pointing to these items on the WB))
e:ehm
GAB: ((points to herself))
me for example
((shaking head side to side))
i don't (.)mind
RIT: (xxx)
LAU: (xxx)
((writing on WB))
(6.0)
a:and
RIT: now do
[elastics
LAU: [(the elastics,)
GAB: elastics ties and springs
LAU: ((writing))
so this (.) is your part Kuca.
((Kuca= nickname for Rita))
RIT: okay
LAU: this is a summary only but
RIT: well
i have the easiest part
and the coolest one
↑wooo.
((all laugh))
LAU: [(xxx)
RIT: [but a-
em but a eh
should we:e ah-
LAU: (xxx)
((moves papers on desk; sits down))
RIT: ((indicates WB with hand))
we present
okay
this is the the the u:um
GAB: ((laughs))
(3.0)
RIT: ((stands up; looks at Laura))
>this is just for the PowerPoint<

```
103         okay¿
104 GAB:    yes
105 RIT:    but when we talk¿
106         like
107         how will we
108         °now it's your turn, now it's mine°
            ((bends knees slightly; sways back and forth as if
            speaking during the presentation))
109 GAB:    i think
110         we can say that
111 RIT:    ((sits down))
112 GAB:    in the future
113         because
114 LAU:    yeah
115 RIT:    first we do the:e
116 GAB:    yeah I think
117         first we do [the slides.
118 LAU:                [i think
119         the first is e:eh
120         make the slides
121         and then send to Mandy ((teacher)), (.)
122         a:and (1s)
123         and when she corrects (.) the slides¿
124 GAB:    mmhmm
125 LAU:    we:e
            ((moves hand, palm down, in cutting motion))
126         we do the:e
            (2.0)
127         (the xxx)
            (2.0)
128 RIT:    ((looks at Gabriela))
129 GAB:    ((smiles))
130         ((all laugh))
131 RIT:    the division.
132 LAU:    okay
```

Laura initiates this sequence with the discourse marker, *so* (line 1) to indicate a connection between their interactions and decisions until this point and her next action. Rita takes the floor to introduce the topic regarding the application of their decisions for future actions (line 2). She deploys an interrogative and uses the future tense with the pronoun *we* in the formulation of her turn. The content of this utterance indicates her focus on their next step and also shows a collaborative orientation by addressing all the members (we) and by soliciting input from them, rather than supplying a candidate action.

Laura starts to respond by overlapping Rita's question (line 3), and Gabriela takes the floor by overlapping Laura's turn (line 5). Gabriela proposes a time (*this weekend*) and the activity (line 7) and is able to confirm approval with Laura's agreement token, *yes* (line 9). In line 10, Gabriela proposes a change to their previous decision to assigning smaller parts and alternating their turns throughout the presentation. She initiates this suggestion with an assessment regarding the lower degree of complexity her alternative option would offer, mitigating the structure with an evidential (*I think*) and also shaping her utterance into an interrogative addressed to the others with a rising intonation. She secures the co-

participants' affiliation with her position, and offers a candidate restructuring of their parts as well as the distribution within the presentation (lines 14, 18-19). Laura displays her acceptance of this suggestion by indicating her understanding of the source of complexity that their earlier decisions regarding parts and distribution would create: making the slides (line 19), which Gabriela confirms as being a correct interpretation of her reasoning.

In line 22, Laura again initiates a sequence with a discourse marker, *so*, to project a closing of their decision to accept Gabriela's proposal and link it to the next action, which is to discuss how they are going to proceed. Laura begins by articulating a possible action and topic assignment for herself (*I can*), and Rosa indicates that Laura should address contents on the whiteboard, where the outline of their presentation has been written and is visible to them all. The others agree to this topic, but indicate she should not take another topic, which is visible on the whiteboard, (lines 32-37) as it would be too extensive for one presenter's part.

Rita introduces a candidate distribution of parts starting in line 41. Formulating her proposal as an *example*, she indicates the part with her hand gesture (line 42) and connects that item with Laura with her gaze and the pronoun, *you* (line 44). Both Gabriela and Laura display their agreement with *yes*-tokens (lines 45 and 46). Gabriela self-selects to extend the definition of the part to include another element (arches, in line 48). Laura confirms that the part they have delineated until then is assigned to her (line 52) as she writes the information they have suggested.

To highlight the division of their parts, Rita requests Laura to write the assignment in red (line 54), to which Laura complies. She writes (presumably) the information the group members have been discussing with the marker Rita has asked her to use, and confirms that her topic will comprise the passive elements (line 61). Rita speaks to Laura in a low volume, which is incomprehensible in the video but hearable to Laura, who then responds by verbally indicating that she and Rita will share this part (line 67).

In line 71, Laura announces another sub-topic and points to them on the whiteboard. Gabriela volunteers for this assignment (line 74-75). She constructs her turn to make it contingent on agreement from others by using mitigating resources, such as the phrasing, *for example* (line 74), to mark it as an option that is not definitive. She also downgrades her commitment to having a preferred part with her announcement that taking that part does not cause her concern (line 75). Laura writes this information on the whiteboard, and they define the last part, *elastics, ties and springs*, (lines 80-82,) which Laura assigns to Rita (84), and Rita affiliates with this action. She assesses this topic, though humorously, as being *easier* and *cooler* than the other parts.

In line 92, Rita introduces another topic with a discourse marker, *but*, which projects a contrasting stance towards the action they are either doing or considering. She continues to articulate the action that she feels they have an obligation to carry out, but she starts and re-starts her turn over several lines in search of an appropriate formulation for her thinking. In line 101, Rita uses embodied action to support the articulation of her idea by standing and looking at Laura face to face. She defines their current action and its focus, the definition of their parts based on the information they will include on their PowerPoint slides. To show the contrasting focus for the presentation, to which she had alluded when she started her turn (*but*), she once again employs this marker to introduce another aspect of the presentation, apart from the slides—delivering the presentation.

Rita refers to their future presentation discourse as *when we talk* (line 105). She signals her question about their final oral presentation with an interrogative grammar construction (*how will we*), and then indicates that type of speaking activity with multimodal resources. The accomplishes this by moving her body as if in another participation framework of public speaking, and offering quoted speech in a lower volume to indicate the accompanying speech (line 108). Gabriela shows her understanding of Rita's concern with a proposal to address the discourse-related issue in the future, a suggestion to which Laura affiliates (line 114).

Rita seeks confirmation for her understanding of Gabriela's suggestion by recasting the proposal to make explicit the action that should have priority at that time over determining the presentation script, which is creating the slides (line 117). Both Gabriela and Laura propose this action (line 116-120). Laura outlines further steps in the process (sending the slides to the teacher and waiting for the corrections) before they can carry out the action to which Rita had referred.

This stretch of talk offers several insights into the participants' orientations to the creation and distribution of parts. The sequence demonstrates a strong stance towards the collaborative nature of their decision-making. Objects of their decisions include: 1) the assignment of the parts; 2) the distribution of their subtopics throughout the presentation; 3) the steps involved in developing the content of their parts; and also 4) issues related to presenting the parts in a coherent way.

The interactants' attitudes towards joint decision making can be seen through the use of interrogatives to elicit opinions and confirmations of agreement from others. They can also be seen in the way that they carefully package their proposals. Suggestions are constructed with mitigating resources to downgrade the participants' show of commitment to or imposition of their own proposals until agreement by the others is secured.

Interestingly, this extract (6-1) in combination with the interaction that preceded it (Extract 5-8), demonstrates an evolution of the students' decision-making process regarding part distribution. In Extract 5-8, the participants had focused on the dynamics of their presentation and had decided to create several smaller parts for each other and intersperse them throughout the presentation. Extract 6-1 shows how task interpretations are influenced over time as attention to other task-related aspects emerge in this social activity.

The negotiation of procedures towards carrying out this shared project resulted in collective and aligned understandings regarding what individual and group-achieved work entailed. It also made explicit attitudes towards the relationship between these activities. When these students had initially allocated the presentation parts (Extract 5-8), their orientations toward a complete presentation within a participation framework of a classroom context were evident in the shaping of these joint decisions. At that time their understanding of subtopic distribution was contingent on audience participation. That is, they displayed a desire to make their presentation more dynamic.

In the stretch of talk shown in Extract 6-1, the participants defined activities related to the development of the presentation, or part distribution, based on conditions associated with other contexts. They referred to a context within which each member could carry out their individual work more conveniently or effectively.

Topicalization of these steps made visible a changing of their priorities regarding the way the parts should be defined. The ease of developing the presentation trumped the need to make their presentation more dynamic. As Gabriela says in line 21, *I think it's not necessary*. Much interaction is dedicated to the topic and negotiation of assignation and distribution of parts among these participants. In this case, various dimensions were explicitly referred to in the negotiation of this aspect (dynamic delivery versus less difficulty in developing the slides). This datum indicates that individual work invested in the development a part had a stronger bearing in defining the subtopic for these interactants.

The extract also revealed the actual assigning of the sections that these group members had previously defined. Division of the parts is clearly, in fact, visibly delimited through use of artifacts (e.g. the whiteboard and use of different colored markers to indicate the various parts and group members). The participants' orientations regarding distribution of presenters' parts is seen to be related to equality in the amount of content they feel a subtopic represents.

Rita, Gabriela and Laura had identified clearly bounded domains in their earlier discussion seen in Extract 5-8. However, the scopes of these areas do not necessarily correspond to their interpretation of part division as can be seen in lines 32-37 of Extract 6-1. Here Rita and Gabriela suggest that one of the subtopics *would be too long for just one person*. In line 38, however, a sequence is initiated by Rita that introduces a solution, involving the inclusion of more than one subtopic within one speaker's part.

With the use of the whiteboard and embodied actions of pointing to the content written earlier, the participants indicate which subtopics may be combined within one part. This is seen in lines 48-49, for example (*that with arches*). This datum shows interactants' understanding of parts as being equally distributed. This feature of their orientations regarding the make-up of a presenter's responsibility then may lead to a part's comprising multiple topics. Number of topics covered, therefore, seemingly holds less importance than quantity of material assigned to be covered by one presenter.

Starting in line 92, Rita launches a sequence that shifts the topic from the individually defined parts to the overall structure of the presentation, in which these parts will need to become embedded. This topic is made most clear in lines 102-108, when Rita acts out her meaning by alluding to their future performance. Rita's turn indicates her orientation their parts as being something owned with her use of pronouns, *your* turn and *mine* (line 108). At the same time, she is indicating a stance the relationship between these owned domains by referring to the discourse that would position these parts within the presentation in a coherent manner.

It warrants attention that though none of the participants are able to articulate this concept among them, they all display their understanding and affiliation of Rita's concern. They do so by means of their reference to when her proposed activity should be treated within the scheme of the presentation preparation process. Their interaction displays a shared orientation towards a clearly defined ownership of the parts they have assigned each other to develop, and at the same time, to an overall, collective presentation to which these domains belong.

The participants also show their stance towards the commitment to practice the discourse outside of their prepared scripts and texts, in order to make clear the connection between their parts and the overall topic through the presentation script. These perspectives demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between their work that is individually developed and that will be considered their own defined presentation realm, and the group-owned product. The students display, in this interaction, their orientation to making this relationship visible.

A further phenomenon that this extract reveals in combination with the interaction leading up to it (Extract 5-8) is related to the emerging aspect of their interpretations of what a part should represent or how it is shaped. The interactants' understanding of a part unfolds along with their understanding of what doing preparation of an oral presentation requires. This feature indicates once more that their interpretations of various dimensions of their group project are fluid, inter-related and situated in interactions arising in this social context.

6.3 Emerging nature of presentation parts

The students' initial decisions about presentation parts and assignments of topics did not always remain intact throughout their rehearsals. Participants' orientations to the nature and definition of bounded parts sometimes changed after they had organized the distribution of parts and individually developed their PowerPoint slides. The students' stances regarding parts were displayed in meetings, during which they endeavored to rehearse as well as combine their individually-designed slides together.

As the students' presentation materializes with each part being presented presumably for the first time, the students witness the applications of their previous decisions regarding many aspects of their project. The distribution of parts is one aspect for which they can get a feel regarding the balance of the amount of speaking time each presenter will carry out in the overall presentation. This new information has a bearing on their interpretation of their task.

The changing understanding about the distribution of presentation parts can be seen in the next extract. This interaction starts with Tomás finishing his part about risk factors, a part that the group had assigned him in a previous meeting (data not shown here). Once Tomás finishes this slide, he suggests that a redistribution of the material he has presented until this moment.

EXTRACT 6-2

```
1 TOM:      genetics(2.0)
2           diseases age
3           (well) anything (xxx)
4           yeah
5 ALE:      .hhh
6 TOM:      (i xxx)
7 ALE:      okay
8 TOM:      (xxx)
9           Oscar
10          if you-
11          like if you wanna take
12 OSC:     [(yes)]
13 TOM:     [wanna] take
14          [(xxx)]
15 OSC:     [i'll ]
16          i'll do:o
```

```
17          a couple of slides (xxx)
18 TOM:     yeah cause
19 ALE:     tch yeah i think eh toma:as
20          [spoke a lot so]
21 TOM:     [(xxx)]
22 ALE:     maybe risk factors
23          and the next one maybe
24          like the last two:o
25 TOM:     yeah (xxx)
26 ALE:     slides should be done by oscar
27          yeah
28 TOM:     yeah
29 OSC:     so after what e:eh
30          Tomàs explained about risk factors
```

Once Tomás finishes rehearsing the last items of his presentation part, he proposes (line 9) to his co-participant, Oscar, that he take some of Tomás' slides. He constructs this suggestion as an offer contingent on Oscar's wishes (line 11 and 13) using a conditional structure, *if you wanna take*. Oscar aligns and affiliates with this action by accepting his offer in line 12 before Tomás has completed his turn. Furthermore, Oscar's acceptance is seen in his completion of Tomás turn during which he announces his future action, *I'll do*, and refers to the object being offered to him, *a couple of* Tomás' slides (lines 16-17).

Tomás aligns with Oscar's acceptance with the beginnings of an account for why this redistribution should take place, but Alex takes the floor to offer his account: Tomás had too much speaking time (line 20). Tomás seemingly agrees in line 25, as Alex continues with a proposal of how the part could be restructured in lines 22-26. His candidate material division would reduce Tomás' content by re-assigning the end of his part to Oscar. This part is defined as the risk factor slide (line 22), extending to the next slides, or *the last two slides* of Tomás' part (lines 24 and 26).

Alex's orientation to the obligation of having equally distributed parts, or speaking slots, is seen in his use of the grammar structure, *should* (line 26). Oscar should have more time to speak, and Tomás less. Tomás displays his affiliation with this new division with an agreement token, *yeah* (line 28), and Oscar's agreement is seen in his next action. He acknowledges the previous proposal activity with the discourse marker, *so* (line 29) to bridge the jointly reached acceptance of the action with his taking up of the suggestion. He presents the next slide using a coherence device to indicate a continuance of the overall presentation; he delineates a previous subtopic to introduce the next, thereby showing the relationship between the two topics all of which are embedded in a larger one.

The instability of the presenter's assigned part is demonstrated in this extract. The participants in this interaction had previously divided the material and assigned

subtopics to each other to develop separately. Their interpretation of what constitutes a presentation part evolved, however, from one being based only on amount of content to one that includes consideration of the length of time a presenter is obliged to speak. This datum indicates that some students initially oriented to a part in the presentation as being linked to a bounded topic or domain. Their stances toward what the make-up of a part should include changed with the unfolding rehearsal activity. Their interpretations of the domains for which they were responsible, in fact, domains for which they had created slides individually, were situated in their meeting interactions.

6.4 Ownership of presentation parts

The fluidity of the presentation section boundaries as well as the interactional context that influences the emergence of these parts can be seen again within the rehearsing sequences of Laura, Rita and Gabriela's meeting, their second one. In the following extract, Rita is rehearsing her part when Laura intervenes to address an overlap of Rita's part onto content related to her own part.

EXTRACT 6-3

```
1 RIT:      we have to find a wire
2           that is exactly the same size as the slot.
3           so that we don't get undesired uh
4           movements of# °teeth#°
5           and we will have (that) [control
6 LAU:                              [(xxx)
7           e:ehm
8           (1.5)
9           this splai-
10          explanation
11 RIT:     yeah
12 LAU:     of thi:is
13          uh eh this slot size ((/sajð/))
            ((26 lines omitted))
14 LAU:     that this picture (.)shows my:y
15 GAB:     your part
16 RIT:     your [part
17 LAU:          [my part
18 RIT:     okay so then I can just (.)
19          like mention it?
20          o:or#
21 LAU:     if you want?
22          >eh the<
23 RIT:     well i > will do this<
24          an:nd i will say
25          as my m:yy
            ((using hands to indicate somebody next to her))
26          >as loli said< (.)
27          ((Loli is a nickname for Laura;slightly shrugs shoulders and
              holds hands outwards))
28          no¿
29 LAU:     .hh no but i didn't explain
30          i s- i only say that there are two [.h e:eh]
31 RIT:                                        [two sizes]
```

```
32 LAU:     two sizes
33 RIT:     .hhh [if you=]
34 LAU:          [a:and]
35 RIT:     =want here
36          you can say something.
37          if you want
38          o- or i have to say
39          because there are different sizes [(and xxx)
40 GAB:                                       [you only]
41          mention it
42          and you explain it
43 RIT:     yeah
44 GAB:     there's nothing wrong about it
45 LAU:     you c-
46          you can only mention it
47          as as loli said uh
48          there are two-
49          two:o [(xxx)]
50 RIT:           [okay so le-]
51          ((gets whiteboard eraser and turns to erase her drawing))
52 LAU:     of the
53          of the slot size
54 RIT:     let me practice that
            ((erases her drawing on the WB))
55          ((laughs))
56 GAB:     okay
```

During Rita's rehearsal of her part, Laura makes attempts to take the floor in line 6, and Rita aligns with Laura's action by stopping her speaking and looking at Laura. Laura starts her sequence by articulating the object of her attention, Rita's explanation about slot size, in lines 9-13. The twenty-six lines removed between lines 13 and 14 show a sequence during which the pronunciation of *size* is addressed, and also Rita displays comprehension checks regarding Laura's attempted actions.

Eventually, in line 14, Laura articulates the idea that Rita's content, which is visible to them all, or *this* picture, is representing material from her part. Gabriela and Rita show their understanding by completing her turn (lines 15-16), which Laura finally completes herself, repeating the others' words in line 17.

Rita displays her understanding of Laura's action as having encroached into Laura's presentation domain as she responds with an *okay* token to show her alignment, and with *so* and *then* discourse markers (lines 18), she connects this understanding to her next action. She initiates a suggestion of how to modify her part to reduce her treatment of the topic that Laura has identified as belonging to her own realm of information to explain. She deploys the lexical resources, *just* and *mention*, to describe a lighter alternative coverage of the topic and grammatically packages her proposal into an interrogative, which is contingent on Laura's approval; she further shows a collaborative stance by finishing her turn with the coordinator, *or*, indicating another option may be possible.

Laura does not respond with a direct confirmation of her acceptance. Rather she replies with a turn that re-directs the right to choose back to Rita. She formulates her turn with the clause, *if you want* (line 21) while deploying a rising intonation to indicate that Rita's participation in this decision is relevant.

As Laura continues her turn, Rita responds with proposal of a future action, *I will do this* (line 23). This turn includes a candidate reference to Laura's part. She uses quoted speech to demonstrate the means by which she will make the relationship between her part and Laura's visible: *I will say… as Loli said* (lines 24-26). She recruits Laura's approval of her proposed solution to the overlapping of their parts with a polar interrogative, *no* (line 28).

In line 29, Laura attempts to clarify which specific aspect of the source of trouble to which she has drawn the co-participants attention. She indicates that she had not, in fact, covered the topic, *slot size*, in depth, but had merely (*only say* in line 30) alluded to it when referring to the number of sizes. Through her formulation she reveals the source of the trouble she has perceived: that the concept of slot size is mentioned in both of their parts, but not fully covered by either of them.

Rita displays her alignment with Laura's action. She articulates the option of assigning the explication of this topic to either Laura (*you can say something*), and leaves the decision to take up this suggestion to her (*if you want*), or to herself (*I have to say* in line 38). She displays an obligation to covering this item of their content using the grammatical construction, *have to*, which emphasizes that somebody must talk about slot size if Laura decides not to include the explication in her part.

Rita begins to give an account for why it is necessary to include this information in line 39 when Gabriela overlaps her turn with a candidate distribution of the handling of this topic. Her suggestion comprises a division of material in which Rita covers the topic less thoroughly and Laura more thoroughly. The lesser degree of coverage is articulated using lexical resources indicating a lighter treatment (*only* and *mention*), and the greater responsibility of presenting this information is given to Laura, who, she suggests, will *explain* it (line 42).

Rita confirms her affiliation with this suggestion, and Gabriela assesses her proposed actions as being appropriate (line 44), or, *there's nothing wrong about it*. Laura shows her acceptance of Gabriela's action by extending the suggestion sequence to include her own candidate cohesive device to carry out this proposed script. She explicates the action, *you can only mention it* (line 45-6), and then uses quoted speech (lines 47-49) to propose a phrasing in order to identify this information as being a part of Laura's domain.

In line 50, Rita shows her approval of this negotiated alternate script for her part. She closes the topic with an *okay* token, overlapping Laura's turn, and marks her next action as a consequence of this approval with the word, *so*. She then launches into a suggested next activity (*let me practice that)* as she erases the text on the whiteboard, which had depicted her previously explanation.

Like the sequences seen in Extract 6-1, this extract demonstrates the emerging nature of interactants' interpretations about parts and distribution of parts that unfold during the rehearsal of their presentation. Linguistic resources used to construct referrals to each other's part, such as *my* and *your* part, indicate an understanding that the information is associated with an owned territory. The relationship between the presenter and her part is that of a possessor and thing possessed.

There is a moral stance regarding the boundaries of these domains, which are not to be shared or treated in an equal way. In line 18, Rita displays her interpretation of Laura's action as being a sanctioning for having explained information that was treated during Laura's rehearsal. She requests permission from Laura to be able to *mention* this topic. She offers to talk about it in a shallow way, and to refer to the information as having been part of Laura's presentation topic.

Once Laura's concern is understood, that coverage of this information needs to be distributed in an appropriate way, the group members collaborate to resolve this issue. They negotiate an agreement regarding primary ownership of a part. The interactants eventually refer to this status as assuming the position of the one who *explains* the content. In this case, Laura holds this status.

The group members also collectively decide that another speaker can *mention* this information. Co-speakers can "borrow" the information if it is needed in the explanation of their domains, provided that they label the topic in question as belonging to the primary owner of the content. This displayed layer of understanding envisions the individual parts as belonging to a larger topic. Rita, therefore, does not eliminate her reference to slot size from her part as she indicates a need to use it to explain some of her own topic. Gabriela articulates this conduct as being appropriate for this context, and Rita and Laura accept this posit. Laura ensures that coherence as well as recognition of her ownership of the information are made visible through her suggested discourse that addresses the relationship between hers and Rita's explanations.

This datum also shows the fluid nature of the participants' interpretations regarding their relationships with their sub-topics. This is revealed through Rita's suggestion that she practice this newly and jointly developed modification to her script, which is apparently not yet familiar to her. For her, then, rehearsing activity

is a means to gaining competence to carry out her responsibilities related to delivering her own part. This action also indicates her commitment to incorporating their emerging co-constructed material into her own part. In doing so, she shows her alignment and affiliation with their collaborative efforts. Such a move shows interplay between individual and collective construction part definition and ownership.

6.5 Obligations and rights associated with presentation part ownership

The data presented in this chapter reveal stances towards the position of designated creator (and later presenter) of a group-delegated area of information as occupying a higher status relative to others' territories of information (Kamio, 1997). As seen in Sections 6.3 and 6.4, the delineation of topic domains was jointly negotiated and appointed by the group members. This explicit demarcation represents an exogenously assigned or omni-relevant status seemingly associated with a certain entitlement and obligation related to the treatment of these subtopics. Furthermore, the time group members dedicated to treating their respective subtopics gives them closer proximity to, and experience with, the related knowledge (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Stivers, 2011; Enfield, 2011).

These two factors, the defined subtopic and the experience developing it, distinguishes the part-holder from other group members as an expert of the corresponding domain. This status was observable despite the peers' fairly equal access to the knowledge and despite shared responsibilities for the presentation of this information as part of an overall topic. While each speaker had obligations to display and 'teach' their area of expertise, and with evaluable competence, they also had rights associated with ownership of this territory of information (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Kamio, 1997).

One of these ownership rights to which the participants oriented was related to the formulation and delivery this information according to the part-owner's own criteria. The scope of this entitlement extended to managing any further development of their script, text or delivery. This element of the students' presentation parts will be discussed later in Chapter 9, which analyses epistemic status and stances displayed in these participants' interactions. However, the orientations towards ownership of these parts can be seen further in propositional contents and interactional features in the data presented in this section.

The following Extract (6-4) was seen in Section 5.2.2 (Extract 5.3), in which participants displayed their orientations towards the importance of presenting accurate and complete content during their presentation. This same extract also demonstrates the presenter's obligation to fully know the information related to her assigned part. In line 10, Rita breaks away from her rehearsing activity to

announce that she does not know an aspect of the content that she is explaining in her rehearsal.

Extract 6-4

```
1 RIT:      and then elastic yarn
2           is something a little particular about uh this¿
3           (.) ehm (.)
4           .hh what is particular about thi:is (.)
5           kind of uh elastic
6           is that u:uh
            ((twelve lines omitted))
7           the good thing about it
8           is th- it doesn't mm
9           cause emergencies
10    →     which i ↓don't know ↑why
            ((looks at Gabriela))
11          i mean if the:ey
12          they exp-
13          they
14          no
            ((looking at Laura, waving her finger from side to side))
15 LAU:     oh
16          ((laughs))
17 RIT:     if the:ey
18          they ask me why it doesn't make emergencies
19          i (.) won't know what to say
20          do you know [what to say?
21 GAB:                 [mmmmmmmm
22 RIT:     no we don't
23          okay
24          hm
            ((smiles; points to Gabriela))
25          could think about it
26          a:and
27          and a- another thing particular
28          of this technique is that
            ((continues))
```

Rita halts her own task at hand, or her rehearsal, to draw attention to a part of her topic for which she claims to lack knowledge (line 10). She displays her stance regarding her own obligation to know this information. This action frames her status within the context of their future presentation event (lines 11-20).

In the participation framework to which that she alludes, she portrays the audience (*they*) as having an unknowing status regarding this knowledge. At the same time she orients to their expectation for her to know this information, and their right to request information about this aspect of her content. She emphasizes this stance by requesting information from her co-presenters about their competence to answer this question, or about their knowledge status related to the

topic (line 20). Upon confirming that they do not know either, she suggests that they *think about it* (line 25), or consider acting upon this state of affairs in some way. She closes the sequence by resuming her rehearsal in line 26.

This datum reveals an interactant's orientation towards her status associated with presenting a topic that has been assigned to her. She indicates through her talk that as the creator of and speaker for a defined presentation part, she should know more about her topic than her audience, and that she is held accountable for being able to answer their questions regarding her topic. She also displays her orientation to the status of her colleagues as sharing access to and responsibility for this knowledge. She does this by means of her request for information regarding her co-participants' ability to answer the question that she has topicalized. Furthermore, her stance regarding obligations related to the group's collective knowledge status is shown through her suggestion that they consider this issue (line 25) for their presentation preparation.

As this project represents a common task within the educational, or institutional, context, it is not difficult to imagine students' orientations towards normative expectations regarding responsibilities involved in maintaining the status of a presentation part owner. Students are often evaluated for their competent display of knowledge.

The data in this study also demonstrates participants' stances towards rights associated with the identity as the group member delegated to take responsibility of a presentation section. Orientations towards entitlement and responsibilities relevant to the status of a presentation part holder can be seen in the content and interactional phenomena of the following extract. In this stretch of talk, Laia has just finished presenting her part and is announcing that she plans to insert an image in her slide. She then indicates that the next part is Rosa's.

EXTRACT 6-5

```
1   LAI:    [i will] put here a photo
2           because i don't like thi:is
3           °diapo°
             slide
4   ROS:    [yeah]
5   CRI:    [this slice]
6   LAI:    slide
7   ROS:    if we didn't-
8   LAI:    retainers
9   ROS:    [ (xxx) ]
10  LAI:    [it is] not mine
11          ((looks at and points to Rosa))
12   CRI:    [rosa's]
13          ((looks at Rosa))
14   LAI:    [it's yours]
15   ROS:   e:ehm
16          ((moves seat forward))
```

17 retainers.

The most evident vocal display of orientations to possession of information, or defined presentation parts, is in the sequence initiated by Laia in line 8, when she draws attention to the next subtopic: *retainers*. She announces the topic in a louder volume, turns her gaze toward Rosa and points to her. Cristina aligns with this action by turning her gaze to Rosa and uttering Rosa's, thus responding to Laia's turn (lines 12-13). Laia addresses Rosa directly in line 14, overlapping Cristina's turn, informing Rosa that the part is hers, and therefore making her rehearsing relevant.

Rosa aligns with Laia's informing and complies with the suggestion that she begin her part. Her embodied action (line 16) further positions her as the next relevant speaker, and she begins her part by announcing the topic in the same style as did Laia in line 8. Each of the references to Rosa's part was packaged with use of the possessive structures (e.g. *not mine*, *Rosa's* and *yours*), which makes ownership of a part explicit.

Another action that displays ownership in this extract is Laia's formulation of her future action regarding her plan to modify her slide. She announces her intention to add an image to her slide in line 1. The grammar of her turn does not include mitigating particles. It is a declarative form, and her account for why she sees this action as necessary is also not mitigated (line 2). She uses the first person pronoun, *I*, to index that this plan and the motivation behind it are in her territory. This formulation contrasts with the ones deployed for referring to actions a member would like to see effected in other members' parts, where more mitigating structures are used, but this will be addressed in later sections.

Besides the linguistic construction of the turns seen in the above extract, the interactive conduct also displays students' orientations towards the presenters' rights and obligations associated with the parts they are to present, or in this case, rehearse. In line 8, Laia announces the start of another part and signals that it is not hers (line 10), and with her embodied actions (line 11), indicates that Rosa should now speak. Cristina verbalizes the name of the next part's owner (line 12). They suspend their talk, and Rosa takes the floor. She also positions herself closer to the camera, making herself more prominent in its field of vision.

Each co-participant, then, has shown their orientation towards what type of participation framework that is linked to presenting a part. Only the speaker talks, and the others do not. The speaker is also the one who is to be given visual attention. There is an appropriate time for when the part is to be presented—after one part and, in this presentation, before another. That the group members'

orientations are aligned can be seen in their coordinated actions as speakership is transferred from one speaker to another in this context.

Ownership of a part extended to the management of the corresponding slide content; this status was not limited to speakership. It is important to bear in mind that the group members had also supposedly developed the slides that accompanied their scripts. This understanding was manifested in previous data shown above, such as in Extract 6-1, when Rita, Gabriela and Laura distribute their parts. It can also be seen in the following extract during which Rosa, Laia and Cristina meeting. In this short interaction, Rosa is rehearsing her part when Cristina reaches over to type something on the PowerPoint slide, which appears on the computer screen in front of Laia.

Extract 6-6

```
1   LAI:    it leaves incisor teeth out of contact¿
2           so_ they tend to:o.
3           ((Cristina reaches towards the keyboard))
4           (1.5)
5           >°to touch them°<
6           (1.5)
7           (ai) què fas
                 what are you doing
8           (1.6)
9           vale
            okay
            ((looking at the screen as Cristina types))
```

In this extract Laia's conduct indicates that Cristina's behavior is not expected. Cristina's typing activity also represents her modifying the text of Laia's slide. In line 2, Laia slows and stretches her talk at the onset of Cristina's move to type on the computer sitting in front of Laia. Laia halts her talk (line 4 and 6) and the last utterance dedicated to her interrupted rehearsal (line 5) is said in a softer volume and is rushed through. Cristina does not give an account for her action, so that Laia vocally requests one in line 7: *what are you doing*. Cristina does not give a verbal reply, but continues typing. The result of Cristina's typing is visible to them all, and after another delay, Laia expresses her approval of Cristina's modification in line 9 after which (not shown here) she starts to resume her speaking.

Laia's sense of entitlement related to the handling and changing of her slide text can be seen in this extract. Her initial response to Cristina's behavior projects her disapproval of this normatively unexpected behavior. She gradually stops her own activity at the same time that Cristina starts her typing activity. She utters a token of surprise (*ai*, in line 7), and requests that Cristina provide an explication her action. She orients to her status as being the one to display her granting of approval of Cristina's encroaching action.

Another aspect of Cristina's action that may be seen as unexpected conduct in a non-rehearser is that she carried out the modification while Laia was occupying speaker status. This represents an action that in itself represents one that should not be carried out during the speaking of a presenter. This can be seen in Laia's behavior as she stops her rehearsal while Cristina is typing. There are no other interactions like this one during this group's rehearsal, or in any other of the video data. When the speaker is rehearsing, the co-participants' behavior comprised gazing at the speaker or slides and embodied actions such as nodding to indicate the speaker should continue.

All of these data show students' interpretations of the tasks at hand, all in preparation for an oral presentation, as including the distribution of presentation sub-topics and the corresponding work that having a "part" involved—preparing the PowerPoint slides and oral delivery of the associated content. The assignment of parts was collaboratively negotiated, and the orientations to what a part comprised were fluid and situated in their interactions during these meetings. This instability could lead to re-distribution of the bounded and previously assigned parts.

Furthermore, during rehearsal, or the first time the group members presented their content within the participation of these meeting events, orientations toward the relationship between the sub-topics, which for each member was responsible for developing, and the presenters were made visible through topicalization of "parts" and through interactional resources deployed when referring to each other's presentation sections. These relationships seemed to indicate a sense of ownership of the presentation material, and this manifested possession of information seemed to be associated with certain rights and obligations in relationship with the presenter thereof.

6.6 Discussion

This chapter has shown students' orientations towards their identities related to status that was associated with the parts they were to develop and present for the oral presentation project. The data demonstrate group members' emerging understandings of how parts are defined in relation to the organization of the content to be presented, as seen in Extract 6-1. This datum also showed stances towards the dynamics of delivery and also topicalization of procedural step as being relevant to the distribution and development of parts.

The data also demonstrated the fluidity of the part organization. Part contents and boundaries changed over the course of students' interactions within their meetings. The instability of stances towards part distribution was particularly observed in Extracts 6.3 and 6.4, where lines around parts were redrawn, so that,

for example, the amount of presenting was more equally portioned, as seen in group interaction presented in Extract 6.3. Section 6.4 showed the participants' negotiation of nuances related to *possessing* information associated with a part. The identity as owner of a presentation part unfolded within the group's interaction during rehearsal, or as a student's individually developed work became visible to the whole group. Section 6.5 extended the analysis of interactants' understanding of presentation part ownership by focusing on orientations displayed towards the entitlement and obligation corresponding to this status.

The data and analyses presented in this chapter are especially relevant to analyses presented in Chapter 7. The findings reveal influential contextual features related to participant orientations to status as a constitutive element in their interpretation of the tasks at hand. It will be shown that these stances strongly shape and are shaped within the activity related to the co-construction of suggestion sequences.

Summary of Analysis Part 1

Data analyses presented in Part 1 have all shown features of the interaction observed among students in the meetings during which they prepared for their upcoming oral presentation. The data analyzed have revealed students' emerging interpretations of the tasks related to their meeting activity, the overall presentation task, and also their own identities as individual and collective presentation producers and speakers. All of the phenomena identified play a part in mobilizing the creation and recreation of contexts in which the participants' activity is embedded.

The analysis of these contextual phenomena is important for approaching further analyses of the main activities around which the students' interactions were organized. Namely, the co-construction of suggestion and scaffolding activities, which are the foci of analyses presented in the following Chapters (7 - 10).

In CA research, contextualizing behavior in suggestion and scaffolding sequences requires an emic perspective. The context itself is intertwined with interaction; it creates and is created by the unfolding activity among interactants. Analysis Part 1 has established a picture of this emerging context. It is informed by findings revealing students' orientations to: 1) the process involved in accomplishing a meetings; 2) collaborative activity involved in developing a group task; and 3) rights and obligations associated with owning and co-owning a presentation part. This framework contributes to a greater depth of understanding in the analysis of the data presented in the next four analytical chapters.

Analysis Part 2
Main activities during student meetings

Notes on the structure of Analysis Part 2

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 present analyses of the activities that were observed in the recorded data of the pre-oral presentation meetings. Two main types of activities in which the students engaged during their meetings were the rehearsing of their prepared scripts and editing-related activities. The students spent a large amount of time rehearsing their parts, which they had developed individually prior to the meeting, Intermittently embedded within this ongoing activity were sequences in which the participants carried out activities related to the re-construction or co-construction of different aspects of the presentation.

It was through these interruptions to the progressivity of the rehearsing activity that participant orientations to the rough draft status or evolving nature of the shared presentation product could be seen. There was no evidence that these editing sequences were planned; they represented natural talk that tended to emerge shortly after the delivery of an object that a participant targeted for modification. It was also through these sequences that greater complexity of interaction among the group members took place, which in turn shed light on the more collaborative spirit that can be mobilized within this type of task context.

There was a stark contrast between the participation patterns arising within the rehearsing and co-construction activities; furthermore, the turns that initiated the sequences during rehearsing in order to propose suggested modifications of the script or slide texts were constructed with strongly marked behavior. As a result, these interactions were within an environment with clear boundaries made visible to the participants, as well as for analysis purposes.

Analysis 2 is divided into three chapters. Chapter 7 presents an analysis of interaction that emerged during rehearsal activity in the meetings. Chapter 8 provides an analysis of the main non-rehearsing activity in which the students engaged: constructions of suggestion sequences. Chapter 9 focuses on a single case analysis of an other-initiated correction. A discussion of the findings presented in Analysis Part 2 will end this section of the thesis.

The analyses presented in this part seek to answer the questions posed in Chapter 1, Section 1.11 related to Objective 1, *To describe the interaction among students engaged in carrying out a collaborative task within a multilingual university setting outside of class.* Specifically it will address questions regarding the *type of emerging and recurring activities in which the students engage over the course of their task meeting or meetings,* and *how these activities are differentiated and also managed*.

Chapter 7

Rehearsing and non-rehearsing

7.1 Introduction

This chapter describes two main activities which the students carried out during their meetings. Chapter 7 is divided into two sections according to these activities. Section 7.2 describes the behaviors and organization of the activity seen within rehearsing sequences. In section 7.3, a global description of the type of interaction that emerged within activity outside of rehearsing is provided; that is, in non-rehearsing sequences.

7.2 Rehearsal activity

Rehearsing a presentation can comprise participation patterns that are based on a more normatively predicted conduct than other 'natural' interactions, such as that seen in the suggestion sequences analyzed in this thesis. In the data studied in this thesis, as shown in Chapter 6, the students had distributed lecture content among their groups to develop and later present. During rehearsal, the presenters followed the resulting structure and sequence of their presentation content, which was visually depicted on their PowerPoint slides. They did so within a rehearsing participation framework in which turns and sequences of talk were pre-established.

The group members were generally aware of the overall presentation, and in turn of the locations where each member should begin and also end the delivery of their topics. No overlapping or completion of turns seemed expected. The students in these data also had fairly equal overall access to the information being presented. Thus, the content related to other group members' parts, or the sub-topics for which the members were not assigned, remained mostly unsurprising to those participants occupying the non-rehearsing positions.

At the same time, however, the pre-presentation meetings afforded an opportunity for students to add a spoken voice to their individually written scripts. This activity quite possibly represented the first time the interactants assumed a speakership identity with regard to vocally presenting the script and slides they had created. Such a situation added a more emergent dimension to their rehearsal of a pre-established script. The rehearsing, though based on a prepared text, was carried out in a new environment and participation framework that was being constructed turn by turn. In this way, the activity within a rehearsal footing was less stable than what might normatively be presumed.

This meeting also provided an interactional space for the co-presenters to develop and practice discourse related to connecting their parts and embedding them into one coherent presentation. It is plausible that this event represented the first time the group members were being exposed to each other's scripts and slides, and in this way they could visualize their own parts in relation to the others'. Their area of assigned expertise became more congealed when practiced next to others.

Along with the conceptualizing of their parts within a larger production, this activity also provided students an occasion to develop identities as rehearsers or future presenters. In this way, relationships between the rehearsers and their designated presentation domains, together with students' identities as co-presenters, emerged during this preparatory session. Students' presentation and identities as presenters were co-created. Therefore, while doing rehearsing is often considered unnatural talk, one depending on a form of screenplay, all of these contextual elements shaped and constrained the rehearsing interaction to render it an activity that could potentially yield unplanned behaviors.

Interactants shown in the data generally displayed an interpretation of rehearsing activity as holding or giving the floor to the speaker, or the spokesperson representing a certain aspect of the overall topic, for which all of the group members were responsible. In Chapters 5 and 6, the data demonstrated students' orientations to their rehearsal as emulating the type of behavior that they interpreted as being appropriate for their future oral presentation. This type of performance was on par with lecturing, where a lecturer publicly delivers a text or script to an audience.

Within rehearsing activity, participants' orientations to rights corresponding to speakership status were clearly displayed through various actions and interactional practices. The speaker was given the floor, and all talk by the co-participants was suspended except for occasional continuer tokens, such as *okay*, or *mmhmm*, or embodied actions like nodding and gazing toward the speaker.

The following data, which were presented in earlier chapters responding to a different set of research questions, provide brief snapshots of such rehearsal activity. Analyzing footing changes within the environment of shifting participation framework is useful for highlighting the features related to rehearsal behavior and interactants' orientations to the status of each participant within this context.

In Extract 7-1 below, the group members, Laia, Cristina and Rosa explicitly refer to the upcoming change in footing in their interaction prior to their rehearsing. In this stretch of talk, they have just reached a decision to rehearse their parts together for their recorded meeting task.

EXTRACT 7-1

```
1  LAI:     we can explain our presentation
            ((looks at camera))
2           as e:eh if we were doing it in class.
            ((glances at ROS))
3           (.2)
4           °no?°
            ((glances at CRI))
5  CRI:     the ↑↓yes
            ((nodding))
6           i thought we [(xxx)]
7  LAI:                  [okay]
8            so i began
9  ROS:     °okay°
10 LAI:     i begin
            ((moves seat closer to computer; laughs))
11  →       eh removable appliances.
12          tch e:eh removable appliance is eh a-
13          no are those which can be removed by the patient
            ((reading the computer screen))
14          ((continues her part))
```

This excerpt shows the interactants' explicitly changing their participation framework. This shifting is topicalized by Laia's proposing of the type of speaking action they can initiate (line 1-2). Once agreement about practicing their presentation has been reached, Laia, who is the first speaker of their presentation, initiates the rehearsal sequence by overlapping Cristina's turn and deploying an *okay*-token (line 7) to indicate her acceptance of the decision to rehearse as well as marking a change in topic. This resource (*okay*) also projects a change in participation framework as Laia announces her next action: rehearsing (line 8 and 10).

Laia bridges her announced future action, *I began* (rehearsing) with the previously displayed alignment regarding their decision by using the discourse marker, *so* (line 8). Her linguistic formulation indicates she alone will be the actor of this next sequence with her use of the proterm, *I*. Rosa aligns with Laia's displayed intention to start practicing her part (*okay* in line 45).

In line 8 Laia self-initiates a correction of her earlier utterance, *I began* to the formulation, *I begin* (line 10). This correction may also further evidence her orientation to a shift in footing as it indicates a consciousness of her use of the language. Such a deliberate correction may suggest an interpretation of the presentation speaker's status in this task as using appropriately structured grammar in her third language. Throughout all of the data in which Laia appears, she only self-corrected during her rehearsal activity.

Laia starts her rehearsal (line 11) by reading the title of her first PowerPoint slide. The practice of reading the title of each slide as a type of introduction is deployed by all the participants in this group's rehearsal—it pertains only to the rehearsing

participation framework. This is one resource that displays the organization of the content, visually and orally. In this case, it is also used to signal a change in footing. The prosodic features that frequently contour the announcement of a title include descending intonation, and quite often a slightly higher volume. Upon announcing the title in the stretch of talk shown above, the behavior of all the participants changes accordingly. In other words, the rehearser is given the floor to deliver a prolonged stretch of talk while the others listen.

Laia's embodied actions also indicate a change in footing, as she positions her body closer to the computer, which presumably contains her script and PowerPoint slides, as she can be seen reading while she fixes her gaze to the screen. Earlier, she was sitting farther from the table to include in her field of vision the other group members, at whom she gazed while engaged in talk with them.

All of these resources and conduct made evident a change in footing. There is an observable shift clearly projected in the students' multimodal interaction from the participation frame within which the participants are peers negotiating their immediate future actions, to a frame within which one individual, the rehearser, is given the floor to speak over a prolonged period of time. No interaction other than listening is seemingly expected.

As suggested above, observing the boundaries that are constructed around the rehearsal activity makes the contrasting behaviors belonging to each footing more evident. The datum above demonstrated a collective and explicit decision to shift participation framework just prior to their decision to start practicing their rehearsals.

Besides the linguistic resources deployed to make visible the boundaries between these footings, such as talk indicating the beginnings a new sub-topic, the students used other resources to mark the status occupied by the rehearser *during* rehearsal frameworks. An example of the emergent dimension of rehearsing participation patterns is shown in the following extract. Cristina is rehearsing her part, while Rosa and Laia are listening.

Extract 7-2

```
1 CRI:      then in eh active elements¿
            ((looking at PowerPoint slide))
2           we have eh
3           first of all eh
4           the buccal archwire.
            ((eight lines omitted))
5           its covers eh six anter- anterior teeth
6           a:an' eh has two handles
7           in the canines
8 ROS:      ((nods))
9 CRI:      eh this handles e:eh begin
10          beg- eh
```

```
11          °begin.°
            ((gaze directed at screen))
12          ((moves body backwards; turns head slightly to others))
13 ROS:     [begins]
14 LAI:     [(begin)] (begin)
15 CRI:     ((nods slightly))
            in mesia-
16          in in mesial
            ((looks at Rosa))
17          third eh of ca-
18 ROS:     ((nods))
19          [yeah]
20 CRI:     [of the] canines
21          of the canines in plural
            ((moves back and tilts head in the direction of Laia;
             looks and points at the PowerPoint slide))
22          °beca:ause°
23          no?
24 LAI:     ai
            ((moves head towards screen to look more closely))
25 ROS:     yeah
26 LAI:     ((moves arm forward to type))
```

This extract follows a fairly long sequence of Cristina's rehearsal. She is following the script or the outline of the Powerpoint slide shown on the computer, positioned in front of Laia. The gaze of all of the participants is directed at the screen, while Cristina says her part. In line 8, Rosa nods, but does not take her gaze from the computer. When Cristina displays trouble with the word, *begin*, in lines 10-12, she uses embodied actions to invite assistance from her co-participants. She also deploys a prosodic resource, lowering her volume when she repeats the word, to identify it as the source of trouble. Rosa and Laia show their understanding of her action by saying the word, *begin* in overlapped speech (lines 13 and 14). Cristina displays her acceptance of their utterances, and continues with her script.

In line 16, Cristina turns her gaze towards Rosa as she again shows perturbations in her talk about a dental term. Rosa responds using multimodal resources (lines 18-19), nodding and also a *yes*-token (line 19, *yeah*). Cristina shifts footing once more in line 21 as she points out an error on the PowerPoint slide to Laia. She mitigates her request to change the word *canine* to its plural form by using a polar interrogative form (line 23), *no*, and indicates the beginnings of an account for her action. Laia responds with an exclamation (*ai*) and moves to modify the text while Rosa displays her agreement with Cristina's request.

The interaction within this participation framework of Cristina's rehearsing sequences shows that even with a prepared script that is mainly being read aloud by the speaker, doing rehearsing represents an emerging practice that takes shape turn by turn. The novelty of the experience is shown in Cristina's struggle with certain lexis and phrasings. She shifted footings to manage the trouble by gaining assistance from her co-participants, but also sustained the progressivity of the

ongoing task at hand for the most part. The interactants' embodied actions coordinated with different turns of Cristina's practice, and they did not halt Cristina's talk. These actions manifested another layer of interaction as seen in their displayed stance for Cristina to continue her prolonged speaking, much like behavior that is seen during storytelling sequences (Mandelbaum, 2012).

Cristina also shifted into another participation framework when she stopped her rehearsing to recruit attention and action to correct a grammatical error that she noticed once she reached that item of her part. The others immediately showed their alignment through Laia's compliance, or move to correct the error, and Rosa's vocal agreement.

Sometimes non-rehearsing co-participants sought to shift the participation framework during rehearsal activity to one in which they could also verbally interact. This was usually achieved by deploying a variety of devices in the self-selection of a turn to get the rehearsers' attention. The next extract, which was seen in Chapter 5 (Extract 5-12), shows an example of this process. In it, Gabriela launches a proposal sequence during Laura's rehearsal activity.

Extract 7-3

```
1 LAU:      of the:e
2           of the desi:ired
3           mmm base
            ((at the end of the slide))
4 GAB: →    i think-
5 LAU:      and at the oh-
            ((looks at Gab))
6 GAB:      i think you should say at the
7           beginning of this part
8           that this is the:e
9           the nowadays uh
10 LAU:     ((looks down; breathes in; mildly shrugs;
            lifts hands palms upward))
11 RIT:     option
```

Gabriela waits to initiate her proposal (line 4) when Laura reaches the end of her explanation about one of her topics. Her suggestion is related to the organization or sequence of the content that Laura has presented. The location of her proposal indicates her stance regarding appropriateness of initiation site of this type of action. In other words, she did not make a bid for the floor in the middle of Laura's explanation.

Gabriela attempts to get Laura's attention by starting her turn with an *I-think* statement (line 4). This action signals her desire to shift the footing to a framework in which she has an appropriate status level to be able to speak, not merely listen. The formulation of her turn, *I think*, projects the type of action she

wishes to carry out in this different participation framework—she will topicalize or explicate her thoughts or opinion.

However, despite Gabriela's efforts to insert her proposal into a normatively expected TRP, at the end of a sub-topic explanation, Laura begins to move on to the next topic, or slide. It is possible that Laura may not have heard Gabriela, but it is also clear that this action was not expected by Laura. The unanticipated nature of Gabriela's action can be seen in Laura's conduct as she cuts off her rehearsing in line 5, uttering a surprise token, *oh*. She gives the floor to Gabriela by halting her talk abruptly and directing her gaze at Gabriela, who then re-initiates her suggestion sequence.

The interaction shown in this extract demonstrates expectations regarding the status of participants within a rehearsal setting. These orientations can be seen through analyzing the location where the shift in footing (at the end of a sub-topic in a rehearser's part) occurs and through the display of surprise at the self-selection of a non-rehearser. However, though Laura's behavior initially suggests an orientation to Gabriela's action as having been unexpected, she rapidly makes the transition to a participation frame in which another interactant may speak. She does not resist or negatively sanction this shift in footing, which in itself reveals another orientation layer towards the type of activity or participation framework that is appropriate during rehearsal activity.

The interactants are *mimicking* the conduct they will carry out during the public, final version of their presentation. They are effecting a footing in which only the presenter speaks. But rehearsing activity also has a more dynamic dimension. It represents a developing behavior, and in this context, the behavior emerges within a framework of participants whose status is different from their future audience. They are co-presenters and co-constructors of a shared task. Therefore, interrupting a rehearsal in this setting is not an inconceivable behavior, as perhaps might be a similar action carried out by an audience member during the students' classroom performance. This layered orientation to rehearsal participation frames was seen in other data, as is shown in the extract that follows.

As mentioned earlier, changes in footing commonly emerged during rehearsal activity. The extracts above have shown interactants' deployment of a range of devices to initiate these interruptive sequences. They have also suggested that the location of these self-selected turns tends to occur after coverage of a sub-topic or PowerPoint slide. Furthermore, the data indicated certain agility in participants' coordinated actions as they move between these participation frameworks. These phenomena can also be observed in the following extract. Tomás is presenting his part of the presentation when Oscar interjects to make a *little comment* (line 13).

Extract 7-4

```
1 TOM:      we don't use latex gloves anymore
2           unless it's uh surgery
3           uhm and the most common thing you'll find
4           is the general-
5           uh generalized erythema ((/ɛrɪθemə/))
6           ((five lines omitted))
            ((begins topic on the next PowerPoint slide))
7           okay
8           if it's on the pulp
9           the first thing to know is[that]
10 OSC: →                             [(xxx)]
11 TOM:     (xxx) minimal
12 OSC: →   have a little
13          i have a little comment to make
14          i looked up how to pronounce ehm:m
15          the word erythema
16 TOM:     mmhmm?
17 OSC:     it's pronounced
18          <erythema>
            ((ɛrɪðɪmə))
19 TOM:     erythema
            ((ɛrɪðɪmə))
20          okay
```

This interaction is unlike other extracts in that the participants are not physically present in one physical environment. They are interacting in real-time, and they can see each other, but they are speaking to each other online. Furthermore, due to technical problems, not all of their video data was viewable as the later recording froze the images during much of their interaction. Therefore, though the audio data is available for most of their interaction, much of the multimodal activity is not seen, and therefore not analyzable for this study.

However, quite possibly because they did not have direct face-to-face access to each other, this group's interaction comprised more verbal resources to display the participants' actions and meanings. Therefore, behavior during changes in participation frames is hearable, and at times, visible within the context of this group's rehearsing.

In line 7, Tomás initiates a change in his presentation topic with an *okay*-token as he moves on to his next slide. It is then that Oscar attempts to recruit Tomás' attention in a bid for the floor in line 10, when he overlaps Tomás' turn. His utterance is not comprehensible to the analyst, and perhaps not to Tomás as he briefly talks over Oscar's turn in line 11. Tomás stops his rehearsing, and Oscar launches a sequence which topicalizes the pronunciation of a term (*erythema*) that Tomás had used while explicating content from his previous slide in line 5.

Oscar first announces his immediate future action (in lines 12-13), which is to *make a little comment*. He displays mitigation of his action with the lexical resource, *little*, which projects a possible imposition that his comment may be interpreted as by Tomás. He then makes reference to his own previous action

related to the mispronunciation of this term (line 14-15) for which he consulted an external authority to search for the correct pronunciation. In lines 17-18, he finally provides the results of his search. Tomás demonstrates his alignment with Oscar's conduct by repeating the term (line 19), and confirming his acceptance of this modification in his own performance.

This extract is yet another example of the emerging nature of rehearsal as well as the bounded participation framework of which this activity is composed. The object of Oscar's correction action arose within Tomás' unfolding performance. In order for Oscar to shift the footing to a space in which he could assume a position that permitted him to contribute to the interaction, he needed to display his desire to do so by verbally recruiting Tomás attention. Tomás showed his understanding of this bid for the floor as he stopped his speech to allow Oscar to speak. Of special interest is the alignment Tomás displayed towards Oscar's action. He showed no surprise or resistance to the correction. He accepted the correction and resumed his rehearsing.

All of the data shown in this section represent participants' contributions and responses to a developing rehearsal situation. Much of the rehearsers' conduct involved maintaining the floor while they deliver their presentation parts and while the other participants listened and displayed their audience status with embodied actions, such as nodding or gazing at the speaker or screen.

Through the prior completion of the preparatory components of this project, a certain level of predictable behavior was associated with this meeting. Rehearsers' turns were pre-determined and made visible through a previously designed PowerPoint organization. Thereby, all participants could monitor when it was relevant to start and finish the presentation of subtopics. By means of this artifact participants could also predict potential TRPs, where they might attempt to shift participation frameworks in order to carry out an action related to the emerging rehearsing activity.

However, although the students had previously jointly organized their presentation content and allocated delineated sections to individuals, who at times even read their scripts while rehearsing, the actual rehearsal event occurred within a novel and unfolding environment. The meeting represented the first time that the interactants heard their own pronunciations of terms, saw their peers' slides and experienced the presentation as a whole. In turn, these experiences showcased their own newly-developed presentation part in a different light.

Such a context gave rise to orientations towards the relevance of attending to certain troubles or objects that became collectively visible over the course of the unfolding rehearsal. Displays of these stances could be seen in the design and

responses to turns that were initiated during the rehearsal to change the ongoing activity. When this happened, the rehearsing behavior stopped, which displayed an orientation toward the changing framework as having a priority status. The environment of the interaction transformed into a more democratized participation framework. In this new framework the co-presenters re- or co-constructed an aspect of the presentation product.

This type of interaction was not written into their scripts. It represents unplanned activity that was contingent on the participants' first experience with a vocal and publicly presented version of their individually designed work. And though these sequences were not originally part of the prepared texts, they were not absolutely unexpected, or negatively sanctioned as breaching rehearsal activity norms. This can be seen in the general acceptance of the interruptive sequences displayed in the extracts shown above.

This brings our attention to the analysis of the non-rehearsing activity—another type of activity that was observed during the meeting sessions. The other main activity that was seen in the data interspersed within and around the interactants' rehearsing was related to the re-construction of the existing rough draft of the presentation, or co-construction of the emerging final draft.

7.3 Non-rehearsing activity

As was presented in Chapter 5, the participants attended to a variety of aspects of their project in the process of jointly developing an ideal presentation. The sequences initiated during the rehearsal activity were anchored in addressing sources of perceived trouble regarding items such as pronunciations, grammar structures, correct or complete information, organization issues and delivery. The ensuing interaction tended to topicalize and project a desire to effect a change in the item in question.

These moves were usually located relatively close to the appearance of the trouble source. As seen in Extracts 7-3 and 7-4, they tended to occur at the end of a topic or slide in which the trouble emerged. In Extract 7-3, the proximity of Gabriela's initiated suggestion activity is observed in the packaging of her turn. She refers to *this part* using a definite article (*this*), which projects a mutual understanding towards the topic she is alluding to. She uses this type of formulation to refer to the item whose location in the script she would like to change (line 8, *this is the nowadays*…). The intact intersubjectivity is observed in Rita's ability to complete Gabriela's turn.

In Extract 7-4, Oscar's recruitment of attention to a mispronounced term, is launched at the end of one of Tomás' subtopics in which the perceived source of trouble appeared.

The resulting shifts of footing led to varying levels of interactional complexity, which seemed contingent on such factors as who initiated the sequence (the rehearser or a non-rehearser) and what the object targeted for modification was. For example, if the source of trouble was a mispronunciation, it may represent a correctable with a single correct option that can be demonstrated by an outside authority. Or the trouble source might be one that could be resolved (or not) by negotiating many options depending on the participants' differing opinions, such as the best way to design a PowerPoint slide.

Referring to the complexity of interaction associated with this non-rehearsing activity suggests a type of organizational structure or sequential architecture. The interaction that unfolded within these embedded stretches of talk was bounded by turns that initiated changes in participation frameworks—or precursors to the interaction addressing the topics introduces. They were also bounded by final closings of these sequences with a return to rehearsal activity.

As mentioned in Section 7.2, these sequences involved overall conduct that was markedly different from that observable in the rehearsal activity. In fact, achieving a shift from the ongoing rehearsing activity to this contrasting participation framework necessitated the display of different behavior. These actions made such shifts more recognizable to the interactants and the analyst. Often the initiator of these sequences constructed prefatory actions or elaborations around the actual turns that addressed the problems. This type of conduct is seen in Oscar's announcement regarding his upcoming action, or *comment* (Extract 7-4, lines 12-13). Such behavior also invited participation by others, which meant the resulting talk was contingent of others' actions unlike the expected behavior pertaining to rehearsal discourse.

Participation frameworks associated with the interactants' attempts to effect change in the scripts and texts of other members involved more active participation by all the group members. They enabled the students' collaborative actions to further develop their work into a more polished version of their presentation product. The unanticipated and complex nature of these stretches of interaction did not pose an obstacle for the students' ability to eventually return to their rehearsing activity. These interactional patterns suggest that students' emerging and multiple layered interpretations of the meeting task encompassed both of these activities.

The actions deployed to open a democratized interactional field that promoted collective editing or creating aspects of their presentation material could very often be categorized as suggestion or proposal sequences. Classifying these participation patterns in such a way provided a salient framework for analyzing the conduct and orientations that seemingly molded and drove this type of social activity.

The launching of these proposal sequences led to diverse interactional practices with varying levels of complexity. The question then arises regarding the methods that the interactants used in this setting towards achieving their shared goal of rehearsing as well as co-constructing a final draft of their oral presentation. How did participants handle the sequences so as to manage and promote progressivity of the meeting activities? And what participant orientations were made visible in the shaping and constraining of their coordinated actions? These questions will be addressed in the following chapter.

7.4 Summary

The data analyzed in this chapter elucidated the type of interaction that arose within two defined types of activities most often observed in the data of the present study: rehearsing and non-rehearsing activities. During rehearsing, the speaker maintained the floor, while the co-participants suspended talk except to display occasional continuer actions.

Though rehearsal sequences were guided by a previously developed organization, this type of task also represented an emerging activity. The students were experiencing their presentation in a new arena. This aspect of the task created an interactional context that afforded attention by others to potential sources of trouble. The non-rehearsers responded to the content presented in the unfolding rehearsal activity.

Non-rehearsing activity comprised more natural, or unscripted, talk. These interactional spaces were open to all participants to make contributions. The marked differences between these participation frameworks gave rise to the construction of boundaries around them. The complex initiation of actions attempting to shift the rehearsal footings to a more democratized one rendered the distinction between these activities clear.

Orientations towards the speaker as occupying a more entitled status were observable. Interrupting a rehearsal was seen to be an unexpected action. The non-rehearser constructed this type of turn by means of complex practices, such as mitigation and prefacing. These behaviors display stances towards these actions as being delicate. However, they were not sanctioned negatively. The rehearsing

did stop, and the non-rehearser was given the floor, though the rehearser maintained the rights to manage the sequence.

One of the extracts (7-3) shows the use of a suggestion as a means to mobilize collaborative work or editing activity. This type of activity was seen frequently in the data of the student meetings. Furthermore these sequences were shaped and constrained by the interactants' orientations to the epistemic statuses that were linked to corresponding presentation parts. The analysis of suggestions and epistemic status will be presented in the next chapter (Chapter 8).

Chapter 8

Suggestions

8.1 Introduction

Chapter 8 presents a data analysis of the main non-rehearsing activity unfolding over the students' meetings—namely activity comprising suggestion sequences. The contents of this chapter are distributed into three principle sections. Section 8.2 presents a data analysis of the organizational structure of suggestion sequences, as well as participant orientations that emerged within this interaction over the course of the student meetings. Section 8.3 provides a further analysis of suggestion sequences observed in the data, through the perspectives of an Epistemics theoretical framework. A summary of the findings of Chapter 8 is presented in the final section, 8.4.

8.2 Suggestion and proposal activity

This section presents a data analysis of sequences that are constructed to accomplish suggestion, or proposal, activity. In section 8.2.1 analyses are presented to provide a general description of the structure suggestion sequences and an approach to recognizing these courses of action. Section 8.2.2 further explicates participants' stances towards suggestion activity.

8.2.1 Recognizing suggestions and proposals

The rehearsing and non-rehearsing activities represented markedly different types of discourse and interaction. The pre-established order of the PowerPoint presentation served as a guide for the overall sequence of the rehearsal activity; in other words, the students rehearsed the slides in the order they were initially organized. When a group member self-selected to initiate a non-rehearsing sequence, one that constituted an interactional field that allowed talk from all members, it was necessary for this co-participant to explicitly recruit the rehearser's attention and enlist their cooperation by means of behavior that made visible their bid for the floor. These particular types of footing shifts, ones recruited by a non-rehearser, emerged throughout the rehearsing activity and were usually suggestion-related courses of action regarding the content that was being presented. They therefore tended to be located near the item, or the source of trouble, that the interactant wanted to edit.

We may wonder how these proposal actions were made recognizable as suggestions. Certainly their location in the interactional context—during

rehearsing when another speaker occupied the ratified speakership position—could have provided some cue to the type of action that would be normatively expected. For example, the group members might have been surprised if a co-participant decided to simply start rehearsing their own presentation part during another's rehearsal space. Or they might have negatively sanctioned an action by a non-rehearsing participant if she or he launched a storytelling sequence about his clinical training that afternoon. As seen in Chapter 4, the students oriented towards certain activities as being appropriate for this interactional occasion, and the non-rehearsing sequences that arose during rehearsing were usually accepted and managed without resistance.

While a certain range of interruptive actions during rehearsing might have been normatively expected, suggestion sequences included among these, in this section questions are asked such as: how did interactants design their turns to make their actions recognizable to their co-participants? How did recipients, or the rehearsers, ascribe an action to their co-participants' turns? How did they differentiate, for example, an interrogative that was deployed as part of a suggestion sequence from one that was merely requesting information about an item presented during the rehearser's part? Furthermore, once recognized, how were these projects then managed and negotiated?

One possible resource that a participant might deploy to secure appropriate action ascription in an interlocutor's turn could be an explicitly stated description or reference to the activity in which they are engaged. The following extract contains an example of this phenomenon (in line 20) when Alex refers to his previous actions as constituting a suggestion for his peer, Tomás, who has been rehearsing his part.

Extract 8-1

```
1 TOM:      so:o then you can- (.2) move the:e (.) tooth
2           more easily.
3 ALE:      is it a cut only in the:e gingival tissue?
4           or >does it go< right through the bone.
5 TOM:      >it goes right through the [bone]<
6 ALE:                                 [okay]
7 TOM:      you can do the cut like in the geniva
8           ((gingiva))
9           a:nd go through the bone
10          or (xxx)
11          [(xxx)            ]
12 ALE:     [okay. cause you:u]
13          you made a difference between cutting the bone
14          and then you said (yeh/ yet)
15          you only cut the gingival tissue
16 TOM:     ah [okay]
17 ALE:        [so:o] okay
18          just that
19          I mean (.)
20   →      just as a sug[gestion]
```

```
21 TOM:                  [no it-]
22          it depends on if
23          (either) you do a flap o:or
24 ALE:     >okay °okay°< (.2)
25 TOM:     u:uhm well
26          one of the most im-
27          most important thing to know
28          about the:e corticotomy
29          is the:e (.) phenomenon
30          that (it) is produced
31          which is called r a p
32          in Spanish it's rap
```

This extract demonstrates an interactional practice that makes an action recognizable through its explicitly stated identification. In line 20, Alex labels his previous turns as being *just a suggestion*. This type of meta-communication device has been referred to as a formulation (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970), an action that interactants can use to summarize, explicate a version of or explicitly assign a name to an action or course of actions to the turns that have emerged over a conversation.

Heritage and Watson (1979) further built on this concept to refer to recipients' phrasing of what they interpret the other person as saying. They analyzed the function of formulations and observed their transformative character in that they could highlight elements of their co-participant's talk, by selecting and omitting parts of the interlocutor's previous turn that the speaker wanted to treat. The ultimate use of this device, according to Heritage and Watson, was to project agreement among co-participants.

In a study of formulations within the context of psychotherapy sessions, Antaki (2008: 42) described formulations as "a powerful rhetorical move", which can serve as a tool to depict a participant's understanding of the state of affairs. And while they are carefully constructed to topicalize specific content in the previous talk that is relevant or of interest to the speaker for various reasons, they are also deployed as a display of collaboration: "It is the ostensibly cooperative link between the formulator's version and that of the previous speaker that makes the move extra powerful" (Antaki, 2008: 42).

This understanding of formulations offers several levels of consideration in the analysis of the extract above. First of all, Alex gives his participants (and analysts) a clue as to how he has interpreted, or would like the participants to interpret, his behavior previous to this utterance. He constructs his formulation by qualifying his suggestion action with the word, *just* (line 20), indicating that there are other options that are possibly more imposing that a suggestion.

We could leave the analysis at this level, taking a type of emic perspective in that Alex has announced his take on the state of affairs within this context. However, CA

also considers the unfolding sequential environment of an utterance. Alex's turn, in which he defines his activity as being a suggestion, does not stand alone. It is not a random or isolated action, but has emerged from a sequence of actions. We must then look at the interaction leading up to this utterance as well as the response it elicits afterwards. And we can consider the use of this formulation within this environment.

At the beginning of this extract Alex initiates a self-selected turn in lines 3-4, when Tomás has come to the end of one of his slides. He designs his turn as a request for information regarding the depth of a type of surgical cut into gingivae. He formats his question so that the answer will be restricted to one of two options that he provides and that are conjoined by the word, *or* (Stivers, 2011).

This alternative question makes Tomás' response relevant: a clarification action indicating one of the options listed was correct. Tomás responds to Alex's request with a preferred response, an answer to the question using one of the candidate phrases that Alex had offered. Alex overlaps the end of Tomás' turn with an *okay*-token (line 6) showing his acceptance of Tomás' response, rather using than a change of state marker, such as an *oh*-token (Heritage, 1985). He thereby indicates that the question he had posed was a known-answer question, or a question whose answer he most likely had access to.

Tomás expands his explanation in lines 9-10, suggesting a display of independent and deeper access to the information he is responsible for presenting. In line 12, Alex gives an account for his request for information action by referring to the content of Tomás' discourse in his previous turns, or by providing a formulation of Tomas' activity. He refers to an inconsistency between certain statements in Tomás' informings about surgical cuts into bone or gingival tissues, the object for which Alex initially requested information.

At line 16 Tomás demonstrates his understanding of Alex's account with a change of state token, *ah* (Heritage, 1984). He displays his acknowledgement thereof with the token, *okay*. Alex overlaps Tom's turn in line 17 with a discourse marker, *so* to show a connection between the previous interaction and his next action, and an *okay*, to mark a closing of the previous topic.

In his next turn, Alex projects a further accounting for his conduct by initiating the sequence with the phrases *just that* (line 18) and *I mean* (line 19), and finally deploys a formulation of how this sequence should be interpreted—as a suggestion (line 20.) The lexical choice of the word, *just*, in the composition of this utterance, has a mitigating effect by downgrading the action he ascribes to his suggestion behavior). These resources may be deployed in response to Tomás' less than enthusiastic commitment or stance towards the propositional content in Alex's previous statements.

Interestingly, the actual object of the suggestion is left unsaid: that Tomás modify his part to clarify or restrict his informing to one of the alternative phrases that Alex outlined in his initial request for information (lines 3-4). This understanding of the proposal is displayed in Tomás' next, overlapping turn in which he accounts for his choice of references to the depth of the surgical cut. He initiates this account with a *no*-discourse marker (line 21), thereby displaying a contrastive stance, perhaps to indicate that the claimed inconsistency was not unjustified.

In lines 22-23, Tomás topicalizes the conditions on which the depth of the surgical cut would be contingent—whether the technique includes a flap or some other option. This explanation is offered as an account for the seemingly contradictory content of his part. Alex shows his acceptance in his response (line 24) with *okay*-tokens uttered in a faster pace and decreasing volume, hearable as a closing of the sequence as can be seen in Tomás' resumption of his rehearsal activity.

This extract demonstrates an interactant's clearly stated reference to and characterizing of his behavior within an interaction with his group members. Using a participant's verbalized framing of his own action as a way to classify it, in this case, as a suggestion, would be taking an emic approach to the typology of actions observed within the data. The use of formulations, however, is more complex than this.

Alex's deployment of a formulation is consistent with those described by Heritage and Watson (1979) and Antaki (2008). This action seemed to be utilized to highlight some aspects of the interaction as a focus or summary of the several turns within this sequence though neither a classic proposal structure nor the proposed action was ever articulated. Furthermore, the formulation functions as a device to display a cooperative stance by designing his turn with mitigating markers and downgrading his conduct to merely a suggestion, rather than a more imposing request for Tomás to change his script. These actions were also interpreted in this way by Alex's co-participant as could be seen by his responses.

Such observations illuminate considerations for analyzing suggestion sequences seen in these data. Suggestions may not be explicitly or simply constructed or readily recognizable. They may be oriented to as being a less imposing action than, for example, another type of directive like requesting or commanding. Finally, a participant's explicit reference to a sequence as being a suggestion may be used to project a cooperative stance.

Extract 8-1 is unique in that no other formulation of this kind, or reference to interacts' doing suggestions, appeared in the data included in the present study. One of its uses was to make an action recognizable as a suggestion, which was deemed as relevant by the interactant. This may be because none of his turns within the previous course of actions had contained a reference to a proposed

action or even contained like a recognizable suggestion. Such interactional behavior leads us to consider another type of resource that may be used to render an action or sequence ascribable or recognizable as a suggestion: normatively used linguistic formats deployed in the construction of suggestions.

The extract below exemplifies an interactants' use of a grammatical format commonly deployed for coding a type of proposal action, an *I-would* statement. Previous to this extract, Cristina had been rehearsing her part in a pre-presentation group meeting with Laia and Rosa. Laia initiates a sequence during which she eventually proposes a modification of the text contained on the PowerPoint slide, which is visible to them all in the computer screen. The computer is sitting on the table in front of Laia, who is sitting between Rosa and Cristina.

Extract 8-2

```
1    CRI:    or mesial direction. (.)
2            it depends o- on the im:m e:eh (xxx)
3    LAI:    ((creases brow; raises gaze from screen to look at CRI))
4            when-
5    CRI:    ((looks at LAI))
6    LAI:    when we use °springs ↓↑°Cristina°.
7    CRI:    >eh uh- when we have a
8            for example a di-
9            a diastema¿<
10           and we and we=
11    LAI:    =want to close it
             ((hands closing together; both look at slide))
12   CRI:    yes.
13   ROS:    ((nods))
14   CRI:    and we can an- we
15           but [it's different but]
16 → LAI:        [i would put it here]
17   CRI:    because distal and mesial are for diastemas
             ((looks at LAI; pushes hands towards each other))
18           or to create the spaces
             ((gestures with hands moving away from
              each other))
19           an- an- .hh[buccal is to]
20   ROS:               [buccal is to]
             ((both gesture with hands moving forward and look at Laia))
21   CRI:    proincline to tip o:or
22 →LAI:     i would put it here
             ((all look at PowerPoint slide))
23           to buccal in order to incline¿
             ((gestures forward direction with hand))
24           distal or mesial in order to separate.
             ((looks at CRI; moves hands away from each other))
25   CRI:    sepa[rate¿]
             ((ROS and CRI look at Laia))
26   LAI:        [or eh]
27   CRI:    or e:hh
             ((moves hands together))
28           put together
             ((all look at slide))
```

As shown in the datum above, Laia initiates a suggestion in line 16 (and re-initiates it in line 20) related to a text in one of Cristina's slides, which corresponds to the content she is currently rehearsing. She suggests changing the organization and formulation of the ideas presented on the slide, whose topic is about the use of springs, an orthodontic component.

She packages her proposed future action using the conditional structure, *I would put*, indicating herself as the agent of this action. She is thereby depicting hypothetical participation frame in which she positions herself as the decision-maker who may choose her own alternate version of the ideal text formulation.

Cristina displays her understanding of Laia's action as a suggestion by involving herself in the co-construction of the candidate phrasing that Laia has put forward. She does not reject it, but aligns with the editing process. In fact, this extract precedes a prolonged project in which all the members engage in problem-solving activity to formulate this particular text (data shown below in Extracts 8-11a, b and c).

The grammatical structure used in the design of Laia's turn that contained the suggestion (lines 16 and 20) were cues to make her action understood. She successfully managed to achieve intersubjectivity with Cristina as can be seen in her responses. However, this extract also shows that Laia's turn, in which she articulates a suggestion, is not without context. She did not merely wedge her proposal into Cristina's rehearsing turns with no opening bid for the floor. A more in-depth analysis shows that prior to the suggestion formulation, there is much maneuvering to create a space in which she can mobilize her suggestion sequence.

In line 2, a perturbation of Cristina's talk arises, and Laia orients to this site as providing a potential TRP as she signals a shift in footing in line 3 with her embodied actions (facial expression and gaze towards Cristina). In line 4 Laia initiates a request for information with the cut-off of a *Wh*-word question (*when*), which effectively recruits Cristina's attention as she halts her rehearsing and turns her gaze towards Laia, giving her the floor.

Laia then utters her full interrogative, a request for information from Cristina about the use of springs (line 6). She summons Cristina by name to answer her question. This practice, the prosodic contour of her final turn intonation, and also her turn completion of Cristina's response with an answer to her own question suggest that her action is a known-answer question, or one deployed not for seeking information, to which the speaker already has access, but for another purpose, such as confirming the knowledge of a student in a classroom setting, for example. In this situation, the question, whose answer is known by the questioner, is deployed to transform the interactional space from a participation frame where

there is only one ratified speaker, into one in which other interactants may verbally contribute.

When Laia completes Cristina's turn with a candidate formulation in line 11, Cristina responds with a *yes*-token, which suggests that she is confirming Laia's completion as being appropriate rather than simply agreeing with her turn completion version. Cristina resumes her explanation, or response to Laia's question in line 14. It is during this activity that Laia launches her suggestion (line 16) by overlapping Cristina's turn. But either because Cristina does not hear Laia, or perhaps because she does not wish to give up the floor, she continues her turn.

Rosa orients to Cristina's course of actions by sharing her turn in line 20, following another perturbation in Cristina's talk (line 19), but Cristina maintains the floor for one turn longer when Laia re-initiates her suggestion in line 22. She succeeds in taking the floor as the other group members turn their gaze towards the object of Laia's suggestion on the computer screen, and Cristina stops her talk.

By stopping her turn to allow Laia to speak, Cristina displays an alignment to Laia's action of proposing to make a change in the PowerPoint slide text. However, she does not immediately or fully display an affiliative stance towards the proposed future action of the proposal, or to Laia's candidate reformulation of the text . Cristiana's hesitancy to accept the suggested phrasing is shown in her repetition of the word, *separate* (line 25) to identify a source of trouble and uses a prosodic resource, a slightly final rising intonation, to show her disagreement or a belief that the phrase is not complete.

Laia's understanding of this action is shown in her response (line 26), an overlap of Cristina's turn, in an attempt to modify her own previous formulation. Cristina then takes back the floor to continue with the construction of this problematic phrase (line 27). She thereby shows alignment with doing editing, an action to which Laia had alluded in her suggestion, but not affiliating with the candidate version that Laia had proposed. She makes the problems her own, and manages the resulting sequence.

This extract demonstrates the complexity of an environment in which a suggestion sequence unfolds in this type of context. Laia carefully primed the interactional field before actually articulating her suggestion. This can be seen by her use of a known-answer question to shift the participation framework to a more democratic one in which others besides the presenter could speak.

At the same time, the deployment of a known-answer question resource was consistent with the type of participation framework that she invoked. Requesting information from the presenter constitutes a normatively expected action for the unknowing status of an audience member. This orientation seemed to be shared

with Cristina as she responded with an answer to Laia's question, even providing an extended informing over several turns. Therefore, Laia's question was effective in changing the footing to one containing non-rehearsal activity during which she could initiate a suggestion sequence. The frame also shifted to one that maintained the identities of expert presenter and audience members, or positions of knowing and less knowing statuses. It was not yet a participation framework comprising co-presenter interactants equal in status.

Interactional moves similar to the ones observed within this overall structural organization can be seen in the stretch of talk presented in Extract 8-1. In this extract Alex was also seen to deploy a known-answer question, *Is it a cut only in the gingival tissue? Or does it go right through the bone,* (see Extract 8-1, lines 3-4) to shift the participation framework to one in which others may speak besides one presenter.

In both extracts, the formulated question was a bridging action that corresponded to identities normatively associated with a presentation context: the unknowing audience member asks a question about information from the content of the knowing presenter. Note that the formatting of Alex's question was in the present simple tense. He was requesting information about the general procedures of an orthodontic practice. He had not made a reference to Tomás' explanation of this item, to which he later alluded as a source of trouble, but positioned himself as a non-expert seeking information from an expert.

These opening sequences constitute prefaces, or pre-suggestion actions, that clear the way, and possibly obscure, the development of their ensuing suggestion turns. Such actions seek to make relevant alignment of the proposal action and affiliation of the proposal object. Though the suggesters (Alex and Laia) used different methods to articulate their delayed suggestions, the recipients displayed recognition of and alignment to these behaviors.

Similar participation patterns were observed in other suggestion projects that emerged over the data of this study. Proposals to modify some aspect of a co-participant's presentation part during rehearsal activity comprised complex and tiered courses of actions, or projects, that were often initiated with opening devices that democratized the interactional space to include more speakers.

The prefaces were designed to project an orientation to the recipients' status as the presenter, thereby facilitating a later proposal turn by making relevant the recipients' alignment to the suggestion making as well as an affiliation to the proposed future action. A variety of practices were utilized to initiate the sequences and formulate the suggestions and even respond to these actions. And while the interactional space was democratized in terms of opening opportunities

for other speakers, orientations to the speaker's entitlement status seemed to permeate in the shaping and constraining of the interaction to render the sequence a more complex context.

The level of complexity that these sequences posed, however, did not represent barriers that the interactants could not overcome. They, in fact, were powerful mobilizers of collaborative interaction that resulted in co-construction activity towards the achievement of students' shared goals. These sequences afforded the collective creation of a coherently designed presentation that embedded all members' contributions into a whole product.

8.2.2 Participants' perspectives

Extracts 8-1 and 8-2 reveal various orientations towards suggestions and suggestion activity. In Extract 8-1, Alex referred to his actions as being *just* a suggestion. This lexical framing of his statement indicates two aspects of his idea of what constitutes a suggestion. First, there are other actions that could have been carried out within the type of interaction that has emerged in the previous turns, and these actions could have had another, more imposing character than a suggestion. The use of *just* implies a weaker form of an action type that could have occupied the suggestion's place in the interactional context (Pomerantz, 1986; Lindström, 2015)

Secondly, the action of explicitly assigning a name to the course of actions preceding this turn as a *suggestion* signals that acceptance of the object of the suggestion, though it was never stated, is contingent on someone other than the suggester—his co-participant, Tomás, in this case. Referring to his behavior as doing a suggestion downgrades his status from one who is entitled to impose his preferred script to one who is offering a possible alternative that Tomás has the right to take up or not.

Laia's use of an *I-would* statement (Extract 8-2, lines 16 and 22) to articulate her suggestion also displays a downgraded version of an action that might otherwise impose her preferred version of the slide text, such as the use of an imperative. The use of a conditional structure evokes a participation framework in which the decision regarding the formulation of the text is contingent on Laia's own judgment. This *I-would* structure alludes to a reality where the group identities, or statuses are different from the current ones.

Finally, in both extracts, the suggestion sequences were delayed actions within a larger project. The suggesters opened the sequence with resources other than the suggestion turns themselves. The devices that the interactants used, requests for information, were in line with behavior fitting for an audience member identity.

The recipients' responses also indicated an orientation to the statuses associated with this participation framework. Such prefacing may indicate that a direct suggestion formulation in the context of a rehearsing activity, even one that is initiated by a co-presenter, is somehow a normatively unexpected or dispreferred conduct.

All of these contextual features and orientations shed light on the interactants' intertwined stances toward the function, or use of actions, namely those related to 'doing suggestions' and towards status among participant identities within this context. These phenomena shaped and constrained interactions related to suggestion sequences seen in the video data.

8.3 Epistemic status in suggestion sequences

Section 8.3 provides a further analysis of suggestion sequences observed in the data through perspectives of an Epistemics theoretical framework. It is divided into three sections. Section 8.3.1 situates epistemic constructs within the context of the present analysis. Section 8.3.2 presents an analysis of orientations toward epistemic status observed in suggestion sequences. In Section 8.3.3, stances toward epistemic status are analyzed within a long sequence of problem-solving activity that emerges in suggestion sequences.

8.3.1 Situating epistemic status in the present analysis

During the pre-presentation meetings, epistemic primacy tended to be occupied by the rehearser. The rehearser portrayed not only the animator of the message being delivered, but also the author and principal of his or her particular part of the presentation. They were positioning themselves as experts of their epistemic domain. As was seen in Chapter 6, the students had defined, negotiated and assigned parts of the presentation to each other. They oriented to the ownership and the boundaries of each other's presentation parts. With this distribution of content to develop for the collective presentation, the students had presumably spent more time engaged with their corresponding scripts and texts than had the other group members. In addition, the data presented in Chapter 6 showed the students' orientations towards their responsibilities for being able to display a greater depth of knowledge about their topic than what the audience would be expected to possess.

At the same time, the students oriented to their statuses as co-presenters or group members in the co-production of their presentation. They oriented to the unfinishedness of the project. This can be seen in Chapter 5 in extracts showing problem-solving activities, corrections and suggestions as participants co-construct their scripts and slides. Furthermore, even though the rehearsers were

treated as having epistemic primacy, the epistemic statuses of the other participants were not greatly lower than that of the presenter; they had access to the same source of this knowledge as they had all attended the same lecture. They had all worked with the lecture content in a prior meeting to determine the presentation's organization. Therefore, all the members' level of knowledge about all the members' topics was fairly equal.

These elements formed layers of context that interacted with the participants' displayed epistemic stances towards epistemic priority, access, rights and obligations throughout the interaction seen in the video data of this study. Their orientations were particularly visible in sequences where one group member wanted to make a change in the rehearser's part. The type of action, suggestions, as well as status and stance, led to more complexity in the interactions.

8.3.2 Analysis of epistemic status in suggestion sequences

In Extract 8-1 of this chapter, we saw that Alex had wanted to address a source of trouble he had noted during Tomás' rehearsing—a discrepancy in his reporting of surgical cuts to oral tissues. He opened this sequence with a request for information in line 3, as can be observed in the extract below.

Extract 8-3

```
1 TOM:      so:o then you can- (.2) move the:e (.) tooth
2           more easily.
3 ALE:      is it a cut only in the:e gingival tissue?
4           or >does it go< right through the bone.
5 TOM:      >it goes right through the [bone]<
6 ALE:                                 [okay]
7 TOM:      you can do the cut like in the geniva
8           ((gingiva))
9           a:nd go through the bone
10          or (xxx)
11          [(xxx)            ]
12 ALE:     [okay. cause you:u]
13          you made a difference between cutting the bone
14          and then you said (yeh/ yet)
15          you only cut the gingival tissue
16 TOM:     ah [okay]
17 ALE:        [so:o] okay
18          just that
19          i mean (.)
20          just as a sug[gestion]
21 TOM:                  [no it-]
22          it depends on if
23          (either) you do a flap o:or
24 ALE:     >okay °okay°< (.2)
25 TOM:     u:uhm well
26          one of the most im-
27          most important thing to know
28          about the:e corticotomy
29          is the:e (.) phenomenon
30          that (it) is produced
31          which is called r a p
```

While the source of trouble arose in Tomás' presentation several lines previous to this extract, Alex nevertheless waited for a TRP to launch his suggestion sequence (line 3). This TRP constituted an ending of Tomás' treatment of a sub-topic made visible by the PowerPoint slide that corresponded to his part. In this sense, Alex did not immediately interrupt Tomás upon hearing an object that he perceived as needing attention.

As mentioned in Extract 8-1, Alex initiated his turn with an interrogative to request information about the depth of the surgical cut that is used in the setting that Tomás had been describing. This question was a known-answer question as could be seen in his turn following Tomás' response to Alex's question as well as his later account for his question. This would indicate that Alex deployed a resource that avoided epistemic incongruence in this context, where Tomás was the knowing (K+), or the expert, and Alex was the unknowing or less knowing (K-) participant. Therefore, the initiation of this suggestion sequence was shaped by epistemic stances toward the epistemic status of Tomás, even though their access to this domain were most likely fairly equal.

The overall sequential organization follows a similar participation pattern as reported in work by Houtkoop-Steensra (1990). It opens with an introductory move, in this case with a question, to prepare the grounds or project an upcoming action. He then addresses an object of trouble before finally articulating a proposal. Furthermore, like in Houtkoop-Steensra's study, an account is given to why this dispreferred action may be forthcoming. In this context, an account is used as "a statement made to explain unanticipated or untoward behavior" (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 46). Alex explains the reason for his actions in line 12, which also serves to expose the source of the trouble Alex has perceived.

Tomás acknowledges Alex's account but does not indicate that he will take up the suggestion, which in fact is never articulated. According to Houtkoop-Steensra's findings, when recipients of proposals did not display a commitment to take up the action that was proposed, the proposer accounts for the unanticipated or untoward behavior of the action itself. In this case, Alex formulates or clarifies his conduct as *just* a suggestion (line 20).

Alex's reference to his action displays his orientation towards the asymmetry in his and Tomás' statuses. By downgrading his action to a suggestion rather than a request that Tomás take up his unsaid proposal to change his script to make it more coherent, he is indicating that Tomás has the final say in this decision. Tomás in fact does not demonstrate an inclination to change his presentation. He instead

expands the explanation of his part to justify his content—the depth of the surgical cut depends on the technique (a flap or another technique, line 22-23).

Alex rapidly demonstrates his acceptance of this explanation (line 24), and Tomás resumes his part. He does not make any move to return to this script and change it. His account for why he authored his script in this fashion, and his closing of the sequence by resuming his rehearsing activity also indicate his own stance toward his epistemic primacy. So, though Alex opened the suggestion sequence, Tomás managed the negotiation of this project, and ultimately closed it. Both interactants—or in fact all three interactants (Oscar did not indicate any resistance to these course of actions)—oriented to Tomás's entitlement which was associated with his epistemic status.

This extract demonstrates complexity of the suggestion sequence in its indirect nature—with mitigating resources in turn design as well as pre-suggestion sequences that finally pre-empted the articulation of an actual suggestion. In addition, the dispreferred status of a proposal action led to an elaboration of the course of actions leading to the location where a suggestion might have arisen. Furthermore, the participants' stances towards asymmetry in epistemic status interactional context shaped the interaction and worked as an *engine* (Heritage, 2012) in the progressivity of the proposal activity.

A similar pattern can be observed in Extract 8-4 below, (also seen in Extract 8-2) when Laia also deploys a known-answer question to initiate her proposal sequence.

Extract 8-4

```
1   CRI:    or mesial direction. (.)
2           it depends o- on the im:m e:eh (xxx)
3   LAI:    ((creases brow; raises gaze from screen to look at Cristina))
4           when-
5   CRI:    ((looks at Laia))
6   LAI:    when we use °springs ↓↑°Cristina°.
7   CRI:    >eh uh- when we have a
8           for example a di-
9           a diastema¿<
10          and we and we=
11   LAI:    =want to close it
            ((hands closing together; both look at slide))
12   CRI:   yes.
13   ROS:   ((nods))
14   CRI:   and we can an- we
15          but [it's different but]
16   LAI:       [i would put it here]
17   CRI:   because distal and mesial are for diastemas
            ((looks at Laia; pushes hands towards each other))
18          or to create the spaces
            ((gestures with hands moving away from each other))
19          an- an- [buccal is to]
20   ROS:           [buccal is to]
```

```
             ((both gesture with hands moving forward and look at Laia))
21   CRI:    proincline to tip o:or
22   LAI:    I would put it here
             ((all look at PowerPoint slide))
23           to buccal in order to incline¿
             ((gestures forward direction with hand))
24           distal or mesial in order to separate.
             ((looks at Cristina; moves hands away from each other))
25   CRI:    sepa[rate¿]
             ((Rosa and Cristina look at Laia))
26   LAI:        [or eh]
27   CRI:    or e:hh
             ((moves hands together))
28           put together
             ((all look at slide))
```

Laia also initiates her turn when Cristina has ended one of the subtopics in her part. She opens her sequence with the word *when* (line 4), a cut off of her question as she waits for Cristina to give her the floor but also a projection of an upcoming request for information sequence. Laia's fully formatted question that follows (line 6) was shown to be a known-answer question, in the earlier analysis of this extract, but Cristina takes it up as a request for information as she provides an answer to the question. This interaction displays orientations towards Cristina's epistemic primacy. Though Laia seemingly has access to this information, she deploys a question. This serves as a device to open the interactional space and also project a stance that displays an unknowing position of an interactant requesting information from one occupying a knowing position.

Once the interactional space has been opened, so that all participants may take a turn, Laia launches her suggestion sequence (lines 16 and 22). The formatting of her suggestion (*I would*) is a mitigated form. It is a conditional, and she refers to herself as the agent of the action (put) rather than directly indicating that Cristina herself should do the action. A stronger directive might have been an imperative construction, for example. Such a formulation also displays a stance towards Cristina's entitlement to take up this suggestion or not.

Cristina's response also indicates her orientation to her own rights to make decisions regarding the suggestion action as well as regarding the suggested action. In line 17, after Laia's first attempt to initiate her suggestion, Cristina does not acknowledge Laia's turn. She continues with her fairly extended explanation, thereby remaining in her position as an expert.

Once Laia's suggestion is heard (line 22-24), Cristina stops her explicating action, and in line 25 repeats the last word of Laia's candidate revision of Cristina's PowerPoint slide with a turn-final rising intonation. This partial repeat of the trouble source invites Laia to repair her formulation (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). Though this turn comprises only one word, it fulfills at least two actions. It displays an alignment with Laia's suggestion action in that Cristina complies by

actively engaging in editing activity. And it also displays her stance towards her own epistemic priority.

Cristina positions herself as having greater access to knowledge related to her presentation part by indicating with interactional and prosodic resources that Laia's suggested text is not complete or fully appropriate. Laia's response displays an epistemic congruence as she initiates an attempt to modify her proposed text version in line 26 rather than defending her original formulation. Cristina's orientation to her status is further demonstrated by completing Laia's turn (line 27) in order to re-construct the text herself.

This datum shows the participants' stances towards each other's epistemic statutes as well as the associated rights to make decisions regarding the interaction and proposed actions. Laia oriented towards Cristina's status by using an interactional device, an interrogative, to shift the participation framework to one in which she might also be able to contribute vocally. The question also displayed a differing access to the knowledge related to Cristina's part.

Laia also used mitigation to frame her suggestion further indicating an orientation to Cristina's status as the one who should grant approval or have a say in the decision to carry out the proposed action.

Cristina's actions and responses indicated her own, similar, stance towards her epistemic status and corresponding obligations and entitlement. She answered Laia's question and she aligned with Laia's action, but clearly on her own terms.

Nearly the same interactional patterns as seen in the previous data of Cristina, Rosa and Laia's group can be seen in Extract 8-5, but with a much faster and more affiliative response to the suggested change.

Extract 8-5

```
1   LAI:    an anterior bite ↓↑planes .ah
2   CRI:    how many:y (.)
            ((Laia looks at Cristina))
3           plates we have.
4           (0.7) five
5   LAI:    (0.7)anterior, posterior, incli:ined¿ (1.6)
            ((listing using fingers for each 'plane'))
6           a:and with lingual [(fins.)]
7   CRI:                       [yes]
8           s- and you can introduce (xxx)
9           we ↑ha:ave
            ((punctuates with hand gestures; looking at Laia))
10   LAI    ((nods))
11   CRI    °(and ↑fo[ur])°
12   LAI           o[kay]
13   CRI    no?
14   LAI    so we ↑have
```

Cristina also uses a known-answer question as a pre-suggestion sequence (Line 2), also showing her orientation towards Laia's epistemic status and responsibility for knowing more than Cristina. Laia aligns with Cristina's action by complying with Cristina's action, or request for information, after a delay and after Cristina has provided a candidate answer (line 4). She complies not with an immediate answer to the question, a number, but with her vocalized attempt to calculate the number by listing, or counting, the planes.

This problem solving action displays a less confidence stance toward her access to the information of her part than what was seen in Cristina's explanation in Extract 8-4 in response to Laia's question. The interaction in Extract 8-5 shows that once Laia's answer has been secured, or confirmed as acceptable (by Cristina in line 7), Cristina initiates her suggestion about how Laia can introduce her next topic. She formulates the suggestion using a modal formatting, *can*, and as Laia indicates her agreement through her head gesture (nodding, line 10) she decreases her volume (line 11) to begin giving back the floor to Laia.

After Laia displays her acceptance of Cristina's proposal by uttering an *okay* token in line 12, Cristina further mitigates her suggestion action by deploying a polar interrogative, *no* (line 13), which also displays that this action is contingent on Laia's approval. Laia shows her affiliation with Cristina's proposed action by taking up her candidate introduction formulated in line 9 and using the same prosodic shaping of the utterance.

Despite Laia's display of relatively lower level of confidence in being able to readily respond to Cristina's request for information, the co-participants revealed their stances towards Laia's epistemic primacy in this spate of talk. Cristina, from a K- position, asked Laia, in a K+ position, a question. Laia did not immediately provide an answer to Cristina's question, which ha invited a specific type of answer: a number. She instead attempted to search for the answer, claiming not to know might have been a dispreferred action in her position as expert or the one responsible for this part.

Laia accepted Cristina's proposed action—she decided to do so—and complied by incorporating Cristina's suggested formulation into her own script in the exact way that Cristina had demonstrated the quoted speech. She did not negotiate an alternative version of the candidate turn. At the same time she took up Cristina's proposed action, she was effectively ending the suggestion sequence and resuming her rehearsal activity. She did not confirm with the others whether this course of action was appropriate or not. She, therefore, was the one who managed and closed this suggestion project.

Though the vast majority of the suggestion sequences were launched at the location where a rehearser was coming to the end of a subtopic in their

presentation part, not all of them were initiated after a pre-suggestion. The following extract shows an example of such a location.

Extract 8-6

```
1  LAU:     of the:e
2           of the desi:ired
3           mmm base ((at the end of the slide))
4  GAB: →   i think-
5  LAU:     and at the oh- ((looks at Gabriela))
6  GAB:     i think you should say at the
7           beginning of this part
8           that this is the:e
9           the nowadays uh
10 LAU:     ((looks down; breathes in; mildly shrugs;
            lifts hands palms upward))
11 RIT:     option
12 GAB:     option
13          so to remark that this
14          is what we do
15 RIT:     yeah
16 GAB:     nowadays (.)
17 LAU:     ((slightly lifts eyebrows))
18          mmm i thought that
19          when i te- e:eh ((looks at Gabriela))
20          when i finish to:o
21          to say that- s this part
22          .hhh ehm that the standard edgewise
23          i:im don't n didn't have the consideration
24          that the:e different teeth eh
25          the different teeth have .hh
26          eh different inclination=
            [=so
27 GAB:     [mmhmm
28 LAU:     it's an improvement
29          that it
30          that the:ey [made]
31 RIT:                 [made?]
32 GAB:     mmhmm
33 RIT:     so
34 LAU:     ((looks at Rita))
35 RIT:     that's where we use it
36          no?
37 LAU:     yeah
38          you think it's better (.)
            ((looking at Rita))
39          to say that (.) it's the most [used
40 RIT:                                   [tch .hhh  no
41          you uh
42          you ↑can [↓say i:it
43 GAB:              [>you can say both<
44 LAU:     ((looks at Gabrieal))
45 GAB:     you can say now i('m going) explain
46          a:ah what we use nowadays (.)
47          ih at the end eh
48          you can say
49 RIT:     .hhh
50 GAB:     we use it nowadays
51          because it's an improvement
52          they've ma:ade,
53          (dot dot)
```

```
54 LAU:     ((bows head, looking down, slightly shrugging))
55          >okay<
56 GAB:     if you want
57 RIT:     uhmm
58 LAU:     ((looks at Rit))
59 RIT:     howeve:er you see it
60          at the moment
61 LAU:     okay
62          ((looks down))
63          well
64 GAB:     done?
65 LAU:     yes
66          ((slaps either side of her hips))
```

In this extract, which we saw in Chapter 5 (5-12), Gabriela launches a suggestion regarding the organization of Laura's content. She initiates her turn with a cut-off turn (line 4), which projects her action of explaining her own idea (*I think*). Laura stops her rehearsing by cutting of her own activity and uttering a surprise-marker, *oh* (line 5), which indicates that this action was not entirely expected, though she does give Gabriela the floor. In this abrupt, yet effective way, the suggestion sequence was started.

The recipient, Laura, and their co-participant, Rita, align with this proposal action in that Gabriela is given the space to take her turn during which she fully explains her proposed version of Laura's content. Through embodied language (line 10) Laura, however, does not display affiliation with the object of the proposal. Gabriela continues with her formulation, which Rita helps complete (line 12) and to which she also shows also shows agreement (line 16.)

Laura further displays her disaffiliative stance towards the change using multimodal means with her facial features and her description of her reasoning behind her present organization—or a type of account. The participant's reference to their thoughts as a means to account for their past actions has been reported by Couper-Kuhlen in her 2007 study. Laura continues with an elaborate outlining of her construction of this topic (lines 18-30). This action also serves to make visible her previous experience with the domain being scrutinized, which in turn, marks her epistemic status (Stivers, Mondada, Steensig, 2011).

Gabriela responds with continuer markers, *mmhmm* (lines 27 and 32), which are not hearable as being strongly committed to Laura's explanation that perhaps another agreement token, such as *okay* or *yes*, might sound. Rita, on the other hand, orients towards Laura's entitlement to make that decision about her own domain (line 33-35). She initiates her turn with a *so* discourse marker, which ties Laura's explanation to Rita's next action, which is a commissive stating what the group's (*we*) future action will be. She uses a polar interrogative (line 36), a *no*-marker with a rising intonation, to make Laura's confirmation of this decision relevant.

Though Laura shows agreement with this decision (*yeah* in line 37), she then displays her uncertainty about her action. She orients to the collective nature of making this decision and requests confirmation of Rita's thoughts regarding preference to Gabriela's suggested version over her own original script. Rita overlaps Laura's turn using hesitation markers (line 40) to initiate her response, which is a negative response to Laura's question. She thereby denies or disconfirms the opinion that Laura had formulated as her own. She further makes her stance visible towards Laura's entitlement to choose the organization for her part using strongly marked prosodic resources (line 42). She constructs her turn with a reference to Laura as the agent (*you*) and *can say it*, to indicate what she is able, or allowed to do (say) to what (*it*—the script) in this context. Rita is orienting towards Laura's rights associated with her epistemic domain—determining the articulation of her script—by referring to this entitlement explicitly.

In Line 43, Gabriela overlaps Rita's turn, incorporating Rita's formulation (*you can say*) to initiate the turn and ending the utterance with the word, both in a higher volume to emphasize her proposal. This turn-initial partial repeat of Rita's utterance is used by Gabriela to draw attention to the specific problematic part of the previous course of actions (Bolden, 2009). In this case, Gabriela focuses on (and contests) the assumption that the trouble exposed has a dichotomous solution, where only one or the other candidate organization can be used. In lines 45-53, she uses a partial repeat of Rita's turn to preface the formulation of her solution to this situation: she uses quoted speech to exemplify how Laura could include both of their contributions into her script.

Laura seemingly remains unconvinced as shown by her response. In line 54, her embodied actions of turning her head and gaze downwards as well as her less than enthusiastically expressed *okay*-token (line 55). Her hesitance is hearable as both Gabriela (line 56) and Rita (line 59-60) articulate their understanding that Laura is in the to make the final decision regarding Gabriela's proposed modification of Laura's part. Laura responds with an *okay*-token to indicate her acceptance of their propositions without committing herself to taking up Gabriela's suggestion. She indicates a departure from the previous project with a *well* particle (Heritage, 2015), which makes relevant to Gabriela, a request for confirmation that Laura has ended her part of the presentation. Laura responds with positive answer, *yes* and emphasizes her response with an embodied action (line 66).

This datum shows the shifting stances of all of the interactants towards the epistemic status of the rehearser relative to the co-presenters. This status is negotiated over the course of several turns. Gabriela's packaging of her suggestion sequence indicates her orientation towards her status as affording her the right to make a fairly direct suggestion regarding Laura's assigned presentation part. She does not elaborate a pre-suggestion sequence, though she prefaces her suggestion

with parenthetical verb, *I think* (line 4). This device serves to make her action more tentative-sounding as a type of mitigation device, and also makes her reasoning process explicit regarding an understanding of a particular item. Her formulation of *you should* is not as mitigating. She clearly indicates that Laura should be the agent of the future action (*you*), which can commonly be mitigated by not directly nominating the agent (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Laura shows resistance to taking up the suggestion, but somewhat relinquishes her higher status by orienting to Rita's input regarding the choice of version. She displays a stance towards the joint-decision making dimension of the task.

Rita readily makes visible her stance towards Laura's epistemic priority through the propositional content of her turns following Laura's displays of resistance towards Gabriela's proposal. This explicit assurance not only displays her orientation towards Laura's status, but it helps create it, as it is a response to Laura's request for confirmation regarding its existence.

Gabriela persists with her suggestion, and articulates a compromise (lines 43-53) which would assimilate both of their versions into Laura's part rather than their needing to make a choice between the two. Upon seeing Laura's continued non-commitment to her proposal (line 54-55), however, Gabriela finally indicates that the final decision rests with Laura (*if you want*, line 56). She thus displays a changed stance towards Laura's and her own relative rights to articulate and manage her own presentation part—her epistemic domain—the way she believes is appropriate.

Orientations towards Laura's status are also indicated by her management of the sequence closing. She marks the ending of the topic with her *okay* and *well* particles (lines 61-62), and Gabriela does not start another activity (her rehearsal) until she has elicited confirmation from Laura with an interrogative (line 64) that she has completely finished her part or that she is ready for the activity to shift to another project.

The negotiation of epistemic status and also emerging stances towards these relative statuses could also be seen in another suggestion sequence that arose during Rita, Laura and Gabriela's meeting. The following extract was seen previously in Chapter 6 as Extract 6-3.

Extract 8-7

```
1 RIT:      we have to find a wire
2           that is exactly the same size as the slot.
3           so that we don't get undesired uh
4           movements of# °teeth#°
5           and we will have (that) [control
6 LAU:                              [(xxx)
7           e:ehm
8           (1.5)
```

```
9           this splai-
10          explanation
11 RIT:     yeah
12 LAU:     of thi:is
13          uh eh this slot size ((/sajð/))
            ((26 lines omitted))
14 LAU:     that this picture (.)shows my:y
15 GAB:     your part
16 RIT:     your [part
17 LAU:          [my part
18 RIT:     okay so then i can just (.)
19          like mention it?
20          o:or#
21 LAU:     if you want?
22          >eh the<
23 RIT:     well i >i will do this<
24          an:nd i will say
25          as my m:yy
            ((using hands to indicate somebody next to her))
26          >as loli said< (.)
27          ((Loli is a nickname for Laura; slightly shrugs shoulders and
              holds hands outwards))
28          no¿
29 LAU:     .hh no but i didn't explain
30          i s- i only say that there are two [.h e:eh]
31 RIT:                                        [two sizes]
32 LAU:     two sizes
33 RIT:     .hhh [if you=]
34 LAU:          [a:and]
35 RIT:     =want here
36          you can say something.
37          if you want
38          o- or i have to say
39          because there are different sizes [(and xxx)
40 GAB:                                       [you only ]
41          mention it
42          and you explain it
43 RIT:     yeah
44 GAB:     there's nothing wrong about it
45 LAU:     you c-
46          you can only mention it
47          as as loli said uh
48          there are two-
49          two:o [(xxx)]
50 RIT:           [okay so le-]
51          ((gets whiteboard eraser and turns to erase her drawing))
52 LAU:     of the
53          of the slot size
54 RIT:     let me practice that
            ((erases her drawing on the whiteboard))
55          ((laughs))
56 GAB:     okay
57 RIT:     .hhh
58          so ↑there's a question
59          that we have to take in count
```

Laura signals her bid for the floor with a performance addition (Clark & Tree, 2002), *ehm* (line 7), which indicates a delay before her turn begins. Rita cedes the floor to Laura who then attempts to draw attention to what she sees as a source of

trouble. Her articulation of this object is a laborious effort, which requires much assistance from the other group members in its formulation. However, when it is understood that one element of this source of trouble is related to possession of parts (*your, my* part lines 14-17), Rita orients towards this aspect as being the problematic culprit.

In line 18, Rita acknowledges her understanding of the problem with an *okay*-token, and connecting her next action with the discourse marker, *so*, she offers an alternative suggestion: that she *can just mentions* the content that she believes Laura is claiming as hers. This formulation indicates that it is a proposed action that is contingent on Laura's approval. She uses the modal verb, *can*; she downgrades her action, or inclusion of this domain, to a *mention*, rather than covering the topic more fully; she raises her intonation to formulate her turn as an interrogative; and she ends her turn with an *or*, to indicate that her suggestion is one among other options. She displays a stance towards ownership of a presentation domain, and also towards Laura's entitlement associated with this domain to make the decision about the distribution of the content.

Laura's response displays once again an orientation to the collective or shared responsibility for making decisions about their presentation (line 21). She formulates her acceptance of Rita's suggestion with a turn that displays an orientation towards the decision as being contingent on Rita's wishes (*if you want*).

Rita then announces her future action, her proposed solution, by using quoted speech to show how she will make explicit the ownership status of the topic that both she and Laura are treating (lines 23-26) by referring to Laura (*Loli*) when she mentions the item. She deploys a polar interrogative, *no* with a raised intonation (line 28) to invite Laura's approval of this script option—again orienting to Laura's higher status or entitlement to decide about this issue.

In line 29, Laura initiates a repair sequence. She attempts to clarify what exactly she believes is the source of trouble. She indicates that Rita's interpretation, as revealed by her candidate script, is not correct by delineating the aspect of the trouble. She articulates the contrastive actions—one that is not accurate, and one that is the correct interpretation—side by side. She prefaces her turn with contrastive markers, *no-but*. She further formulates her repair by referring to the incorrect interpretation using a negative structure in reference to her past actions, *what she didn't do*, then locating the correct interpretation of her action directly afterwards (*I only say*... line 30).

Laura's turn indicates her stance that the domain has not been clearly divided between them. Rita then offers another suggestion to how they could distribute the explanation of this information (line 33-39). She orients to Laura's status as taking part in the decision-making by the repetitive, *if you want* clauses (lines 33,

35, 37). She also indicates that the object must be covered by one of them, but she formulates her reference to this action as being done by Laura's through the use of a modal verb, *can* (line 36). When she outlines the other option, which would mean that the action would be carried out by her (line 38) she formats the turn as an obligation (*I have to*).

Gabriela enters the interaction in line 40, once again articulating an inclusive solution, rather than a one built on a dichotomous perspective of the relationship between the options. She uses Rita's and Laura's previously stated contributions (*only mention* and *explain it*) in her suggestion, thereby not only incorporating propositions from both of their suggestions but also including both of them as agents of the future actions of the proposal. This turn also indicates her orientation towards her own entitlement to make a proposal regarding parts that do not pertain to her domain as well as regarding the other members' actions. She further assesses her proposal as being appropriate (line 44), or as not being inappropriate (*there's nothing <u>wrong</u> about it.*)

It is Laura, however, who makes the final decision. Though she reiterates what the other two members have suggested (lines 45-48), Rita displays a stance towards the entitlement to make this decision as belonging to Laura, as the main owner of this territory of information. Rita occupies the *<u>only</u> mentioner* position while Laura is the *sayer* of the information. Rita articulates her agreement or acceptance of Laura's candidate script with an *okay*-token and a *so* discourse marker (line 50) to announce that her following action is a consequence of her acceptance. She shows her compliance with Laura's suggestion by requesting permission to practice the proposed phrasing (line 54). Gabriela grants the permission with an *okay*-token (line 56) and Rita initiates her rehearsal of this modified version of her text.

This interaction demonstrates participants' orientations towards a need to make explicit the hierarchy of ownership of an epistemic domain if parts of it are to be shared by co-presenters. The interactants' references to actions indicate that mentioning is a downgraded version of saying or explaining content as the verb mention was prefaced with the qualifier, *just* (line 18) and *only* (lines 39 and 46). Furthermore, Rita as well as Laura display a stance towards Laura's higher epistemic status as holder of the rights to decide on the actions related to who gets to articulate or address what. These orientations are all displayed through their suggestions that unfold over this sequence, thus demonstrating similar findings to Schegloff's (2007) regarding request sequences, during which the presence of one may lead to others.

In this extract, Laura had initiated the suggestion sequence, and through the negotiation of the suggestion, the epistemic entitlement to decide, as well as the final proposed action, she was ultimately deferred to as the participant who had the final say about how to articulate the presentation content.

Nevertheless, it was Rita, whose part was in the process of being rehearsed, who closed the sequence and also resumed the ongoing rehearsing activity. The status of the rehearser is therefore displayed in her management of this sequence, even though the participants—including Rita—did not orient towards her making the decision about her own script. In this case entitlement related to epistemic status shaped the contents of the suggestion sequence, which was bounded by the ongoing rehearsal activity. The rehearser's status was exhibited as possessing another layer of entitlement regarding the overall organizational structure of the ongoing activity. There are then (at least) two different statuses at play in managing this spate of talk within this context.

The following extract in Oscar, Tomás and Alex's meeting demonstrate another type of suggestion sequence organization. Tomás initiates a suggestion sequence using a pre-suggestion sequence to introduce an element in Oscar's presentation that he considers a source of trouble.

Extract 8-8

```
1 OSC:      then (.) eh pain
2           pain appears
3           when too much force is applied to a tooth
            ((seventeen lines of Oscar's rehearsing omitted))
4           pain usually lasts for about two to four days.
5 TOM: →    about the pain?
6           i remember the teacher said (.) tha:at
7           >it wasn't a compulsory thing.<
8           that some patients do (.)feel pain
9           but others don't.
10          like
11 OSC:     (xxx)
12 TOM:     it >depends on the force you< apply
13          and like if you can say that
14          it's >not compulsory to< feel pain
15 OSC:     (xxx)
16 TOM:     well i- i would say
17          cause sometimes people is afraid¿ (.)
18          of wearing orthodontics
19 ALE:     okay
20          and i'd say
21          eh we're going too quick through the slides
22          like we there's no introduction to (.)
23          u:uh what is coming next
24          like oscar in:n slide six
25          e:eh made a small comment on
26          on each section
27          he was going to explain
28          but then he
29          when he went from section to section
30          he went directly to the first point
31          in each uh# slide
32          maybe (.) give the:e the audience
33          or #uh# the people who are listening (.)
34          an introduction
35          which is not part of the slide
36          so they ar:re feeling that there is no reading
37          an no-
```

```
38          there's e:eh (.) an understanding of
39          what we're explaining
40          beyond what is in (.)
41          written in each slide
42          maybe #i-
43          it's just a feeling ma-
44          i'm getting
45 TOM:     yes
46          i- i'm fine with this (one)
47 ALE:     okay
48          so just like slower and i-
49          introdu:uce examples or something
50          (.)
51          if [you're] okay
52 TOM:        [(xxx)]
53 OSC:     (after) we talked about pain?
54          e:ehm the next slide ehm
55          talks about the source of pain.
56          well usually e:ehm (1s)
57          eh the source of pain
58          may variate eh
59          depending on which area of the tooth
60          ((continues))
```

Tomás waits for Oscar to come to an end of his subtopic regarding the onset of pain after orthodontic treatment has been applied before he initiates his suggestion sequence in line 5. He initiates a turn by addressing the topic of the trouble to which he would like to draw Oscar's attention, *about the pain*. He attenuates his action by use of a rising intonation.

In line 6, Tomás launches into a sequence which comprises an elaborated account which foreshadows his suggested change to Oscar's script. He first alludes to the teacher, whose lecture they are summarizing, and the content that this expert explicated regarding this topic. He frames this setting as his memory; making mental processes explicit can be another way to make this action less direct (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The reference to a past participation framework positions the teacher as the authoritative figure, one with a higher epistemic status than either Oscar or Tomás. Tomás uses reported speech to display the discrepancy between Oscar's informing and what that of the teacher's (lines 6-14).

Oscar response (not understood in the recording) makes relevant to Tomás an explicit articulation of his suggestion in line 16, which is prefaced with *well* to mark a movement to this next action (Schegloff, 2007). He formulates his suggestion with an *I-would* statement, indicating the action he would prefer if the decision were his to make. In lines 17-18, he provides an account for his suggestion—that people are sometimes afraid of wearing orthodontics. In this way, he generalizes the need for his suggestion as not one based solely on his desires.

This datum demonstrates another type of pre-suggestion sequence, which comprises an allusion to another participation framework (Tomás' memory about the lecture—not what he claims to know himself) and the reported speech of their teacher, who is their collectively recognized authority on the subject for which Oscar is responsible. Through these mitigating resources, Tomás is able to highlight a source of trouble regarding the accuracy of Oscar's script.

When Oscar does not take up the projected action during this sequence, Tomás must make his proposing explicit. The articulation of his suggestion is also constructed with the conditional and offers an account for carrying out this directive. All of these resources display Tomás stance towards Oscar´s entitlement to accept or reject Tomás' suggestion even after referring to the higher epistemic status of their professor.

Another outcome of the democratization of this interactional space by means of Tomás' suggestion sequence is further shown by Alex's next turn. In line 19, Alex uses an okay token to mark his acceptance of the previous interaction as well as to close the topic of this sequence. He immediately launches another suggestion sequence, which is initiated with the coordinator *and* (line 20) to indicate that his next action will continue with the same type of project that Tomás had carried out. He formulates or announces his action using a conditional (*would say*) to mitigate the force of his next move, which is to identify the source of trouble he perceives.

His description of the trouble is elaborated over several turns (lines 21-31). The trouble he defines is related to the presentation's pace. Though he refers at first to all of the group (*we're going too quick*, line 21) or a null reference (*there's no introduction*, line 22), he finally uses Oscar as an example (*like Oscar*, line 24). However, he prefaces the targeted problem with an example of Oscar's good behavior (lines 24-27) before articulating what he feels is the improvable behavior (*but then he*, lines 28-31).

In line 32, Alex articulates his suggestion, which is to give an introduction to each slide as part of the script but not the text of the slide. He constructs his suggestion by embedding it into a multi-layered account. He packages his suggestion with an attenuated imperative using the adverb *maybe* to head the sequence. After expressing the action he desires Oscar to take up (*give*) he refers to whom Oscar should give something, the *audience*. He further defines the audience's particular status as the recipients of this act (*the people who are listening*, line 33) thereby making this suggestion even more relevant. He qualifies the type of introduction he believes is appropriate with the clause, *which is not part of the slide* (line 35). In lines 36-41, he provides an account for the type of introduction he has described by again referring to the recipiency of the their actions *(so they are feeling that there is no reading*, line 33).

In line 42, Alex downgrades his previous suggestion action by referring to it as his own perception or opinion of the situation. He initiates this move with the adverb maybe, to display mitigation of his conduct. He refers to his attitudes or assessment of the situation that was displayed in the suggestion sequence as *just a feeling* (line 43), indicating that a feeling is lesser, or more subjective, than a greater understanding. He is downgrading his epistemic status by suggesting that his knowledge regarding situation he has described may only be based on his emotional reaction rather than his expertise of the matter.

In line 45, Tomás confirms that he agrees with or accepts Alex's proposal with an affirmative, yes, and further makes visible his acceptance by stating his opinion about Alex's actions (line 46.)

Having secured confirmation of agreement from Tomás, Alex marks the ending of the topic with an *okay* token (line 47). He indicates the consequences of the previous course of action with a *so* discourse marker (line 48), which prefaces a summary of the accepted proposed action: a slower pace and inclusion of an introduction (lines 48-29). After a delay, Alex displays a stance towards Oscar's status as the one who will ultimately decide whether this suggestion is taken up or not as he seeks confirmation of his acceptance with an *if you're okay clause* (line 50).

We cannot hear whether Oscar explicitly articulates an confirmation, but his compliance with Alex's suggestion indicates he did not reject it. In line 53, as he resumes his rehearsal, he does, in fact, incorporate an introduction for the next slide by referring to the previous slide's topic, and then to the next slide's (line 54).

This datum demonstrates that although one suggestion sequence opened the interactional field to facilitate another suggestion, orientations toward the ownership of the part were clearly present throughout all of the interaction. Alex's proposal comprised many complex turns designed to display his stances towards the rights belonging to ownership status. He projected mitigation with the use of conditionals, expressions of uncertainty (*maybe*), and elaborate accounts for his actions and proposed action, and downgrading his own epistemic status. And though he managed to recruit Tomás acceptance of his suggestion, he sought Oscar's as well by making explicit his stance towards Oscar's entitlement to decide the outcome of his proposal.

This extract did not show Oscar's participation much more than his rehearsing activity. It was Oscar, though, who ultimately made the decision to take up the suggested action, and thereby closed the sequence to resume the ongoing activity of rehearsing.

In the following extract, Alex is describing bone formation patterns in the skull of growing children. He is using the visuals from the PowerPoint slide to explain the process. Tomás initiates a suggestion sequence in line 7.

Extract 8-9

```
1 ALE:      so the bone basically starts to grow
2           from the yellow lines¿
3           in the direction of the blue lines. (.)
4           until they meet in the center¿
5           and the suture is closed again (.)
6           .hhh [u:uh ]
7 TOM:           [i wou-] i would (comment here) that
8           once that the suture is closed¿
9           we can:not expand or reduce (it [uh)]
10 ALE:                                     [okay]
11          okay
12 TOM:     widen the:e
13 ALE:     okay
14 OSC:     [yeah]
15 TOM:     [the:e] >maxilla<
16 OSC:     that's why ehm
17          trying to expand e:eh the maxillary bone¿
18          we try to do it when the patient is young
19          because the amount of e:eh growth
20          that we can create or generate¿ (.)
21          once we use the:e (.)
22          the orthodontics apparatus
23          can be way bigger than the patient is (xxx)
24 ALE:     so you would comment that the specific case eh
25          applieds
26          applies to children
27          who have not completed their growth
28          right?
29 TOM:     [yeah]
30 OSC:     [(yeah)] (xxx)
31 ALE:     [okay so i'll jus-]
32 OSC:     [(xxx)]
33 ALE:     okay i comment on on the specifics of this case
34          which is the one presented to us
35          a:and u:uh i just say it's
36          it's how a:a
37          an adolescent would be treated
38          and that after a period of time
39          when they are sixtee:en seventeen
40          it's no longer possible to use the te-
41          this technique (.)
42 OSC:     ↑↓mmhmm
43 ALE:     okay?
44 TOM:     ↓↑mmhm
45 ALE:     so u:uh
46          here are-
```

Tomás does not elaborate a pre-suggestion sequence (line 7) but directly initiates his suggestion right after Alex has finished explaining the contents of his slide. He formulates the suggestion with a mitigating conditional structure, *I would comment*. This action is not only located at an appropriate TRP, or ending of a subtopic, but it is also situated at the site in the presentation where he believes the

proposed action should be carried out. He makes this explicit by referring to the place (*here*). In the lines that follow (lines 8-15) he outlines the information that he believes should be included at that point.

Alex and Oscar align with this suggestion action and also indicate their acceptance and agreement thereof (lines 10, 13 and 14). Oscar further displays his alignment and affiliation to the suggestion by expanding this explanation to provide an account for the propositional content of the information that Tomás has introduced (lines 16-23).

Alex seeks confirmation of his understanding of the proposed addition to his script. He indicates that his next action is a consequence of the previous turns using the discourse marker, *so* (line 24) to preface his turn. He formulates his action by using the same suggestion format as did Tomás (*you would comment*, line 24), and then recasts or summarizes their contributions into his own candidate phrasing (lines 24-27). He requests their confirmation that his version is in alignment with their understanding, and both Tomás and Oscar indicate their acceptance of his action (lines 29-30).

Alex indicates his agreement and the closing of this topic with an *okay*-token (line 33), and articulates a commissive statement, incorporating some of the contents form his the phrasing he had formulated in his previous turn (*comment on the specifics*, line 33). He further develops his expanded script in lines 35-41, making explicit that this is associated with the future action that he will carry out (*I just say*, line 35).

Oscar displays his agreement in line 42, and after Alex seeks confirmation (line 43) from Tomás, he also shows his acceptance of Alex's action in the same format as Oscar's (line 44). After the display of consensus by both co-participants, Alex closes the sequence with a discourse marker, *so* (line 45) to bridge his next action with the previous one, and resumes his rehearsal.

This datum is of particular interest in that the displays of stances towards Alex's epistemic priority were not as extensive as those seen in other interactions. This may be partly due to the fact that this group's meeting was carried out online. Therefore, other types of contextual features that might be seen in face-to-face interactions were not available to these participants. Tomás did use grammatical resources to structure a more mitigating format for his suggestion (the conditional), but other forms of attenuation were not used. It is Alex, in this spate of talk, who shows his stances to both the collective nature of the decision-making and his own epistemic status in regards to the corresponding obligations and rights.

Alex displays a collaborative stance towards his co-participants by means of his alignment with the suggestion action and also the proposed action. He indicates his willingness to take up the suggestion for an expanded version of his script by complying with the proposed action; he incorporates their input into a candidate script for his part and he requests their approval of this formulation. By doing this action, he is also managing the interaction. He is the author of this re-created script. Upon enlisting their agreement, he then announces his future action, formatting his statement as a declarative (*I comment*, line 33). He also includes more information to this additional script, thus displaying his independent access to this domain (lines 35-42), as well as a greater depth of this area.

Alex manages the closing of this sequence by enlisting his co-participants' acceptance of his newly developed script, and returns to the ongoing rehearsing activity.

Most, but not all, suggestions were accepted within the interactions of the data shown in this study. In the following extract, Rosa unsuccessfully attempts to persuade Laia to modify the text in her PowerPoint slide. She initiates this sequence after Laia has attempted to resume her rehearsal following a brief interruption.

Extract 8-10

1	LAI:	*vale*
		okay
		((looking at the PowerPoint slide as Cristina types))
2		[post]erior=
3	ROS: →	[but]
4	LAI:	=linga-
5	ROS: →	there are a lot of (.) letter no?
6		(0.7)
		((letter=words; looks at Cristina))
7		isn't it?
		((creases forehead; squints))
8		((laughs))
9		no
10		there are?
11		aren:n't (.) they?
12		((laughs))
13	LAI:	((laughs a little; stops))
14	CRI	°*és igual*°
		°it doesn't matter°
15		((covers mouth with hand; looks at screen))
16	LAI:	*no sé*
		i don't know
17		*jo crec que:e*
		i think tha:at
18	CRI:	°no°
		((looking down))
19	LAI:	*jo ho deixeria ↓així eh?*
		i'd leave it like ↓this eh¿
20		>posterior lingual fins.<

Rosa initiations her turn with a contrastive marker, *but* (line 3), which overlaps Laia's turn. She waits until she has the floor, which Laia gives her by cutting off her talk in line 4. Rosa draws attention to the source of trouble she has noted in the PowerPoint slide by means of a negative assessment formulated as a declarative (line 5). She articulates her opinion that the slide contains excess text. She finishes this assessment with a polar interrogative, *no*, indicated as such by the rising intonation.

Laia does not respond immediately, which projects disagreement, or a dispreferred action. Rosa then attempts to correct the formulation of her polar question by recasting it into a tag question (line 7). She deploys embodied actions (facial expressions in line 7) to display her thinking process as she wrestles with searching for the correct language construction of the question, and laughs in the process.

This conduct is in line with the findings by Houtkoop-Steensra (1990), which demonstrated that when the proposee did not display commitment to taking up the proposer's suggested action, the proposer addressed her or his previous unexpected behavior, or directive action. While Rosa does not explicitly topicalize her action, she does draw the attention to its formulation, and through this action, she downgrades her epistemic access towards the use of the language to do so. Furthermore, she laughs during this process, a practice listed by Brown and Levinson (1987) as a politeness strategy in face-threatening situations. This conduct displays Rosa's response to the delay after her action, which is being oriented to as dispreferred.

Laia shows some level of affiliation with Rosa's humorous self-correction by means of a brief laugh (line 13). It is Cristina, who explicitly shows her disaffiliation with Rosa's implicit suggestion that Laia reduce the amount of text in her slide. She formulates her rejection in a lower tone (line 14) and code-switches. Her statement itself openly displays her negative stance towards the proposal. However, these behaviors, combined with her embodied actions (covering her mouth and not making eye contact), position her into a secondary recipient position, or a participant to whom this suggestion was not directed.

Laia, who is the primary recipient and whose PowerPoint slide is being treated, finally responds in line 16. She claims a lack of knowledge, another cue that she orients to Rosa's assessment, which projects an unsaid suggestion, as a dispreferred action. She prefaces her next action with an evidential (*I think that*, line 17), which also displays uncertainty or hesitancy. Cristina baldly demonstrates her rejection in line 18 with a simple, *no*, but maintains a lower volume thereby indicating that the decision to accept or reject the suggestion is not up to her.

In line 19, Laia's articulates her decision regarding the unsaid proposed change. She increases the tempo of her utterance, which is hearable as a rush through (Schegloff, 1982). She constructs her turn as an *I-would* statement as well as a type of polar interrogative with a rising final-turn intonation to display a level of mitigation to weaken the force of her action. These resources combine to formulate her rejection of Rosa's suggestion. The speed of her articulated rejection and lack of time between that turn and her resumption of rehearsing (line 20) did not allow Rosa any space to take another turn.

Laia's conduct revealed that: 1) she did interpret Rosa's turn as a suggestion, or her approval or disapproval of the suggestion was a relevant action; and 2) that rejecting the proposal was a also dispreferred action as well.

All of the members' behavior displayed their orientations towards the entitlement that Laia possessed as the owner of her presentation part, or epistemic domain. This domain extended to the artifacts that she used to support the articulation of her information. Rosa's pre-suggestion was in the form of a negative assessment and also formulated as a declarative, but she shaped it into a type of request for confirmation using a polar interrogative. This and her other hedging devices (self-correction and laughter) displayed her orientation towards Rosa's higher epistemic status. Cristina responded to Rosa, but positioned herself as a ratified listener (Goffman, 1981) rather than an official recipient, or the interactant responsible for articulating the response, or deciding to accept or reject the proposal.

Laia positioned herself as the one entitled to make the final decision to reject the proposal, which she did, but in a mitigated fashion. She also managed the closing of this sequence, and did so in a rushed fashion so as to avoid any expansion of this topic. These actions demonstrate that the status of epistemic primacy garners a certain level of entitlement to make decisions regarding the treatment of their domain. Nevertheless, a certain level of cooperation is also normatively expected by the group members whose status is that of co-presenters, who share responsibilities for the material.

Laia oriented towards her rejection as a dispreferred action. Therefore, a preferred action might have been further negotiation of the proposed action or collaborative co-construction of the presentation material, like is seen in all the other interactions—this interaction contained the only blatant or visible rejection of a proposal.

In fact, the main function and outcome of these suggestion sequences were cooperative in nature. The initiation of a suggestion was oriented to as problematic, and also clearly shaped and constrained by orientations towards the

rights and obligations associated with the rehearser, or the member occupying the highest epistemic status. However, they often led to collaborative conduct such as negotiating the proposed action, or when needed, problem-solving activity related to the modification of the identified source of trouble.

Though varied in complexity and duration, problem-solving activity seen in the data of the present study, tended to comprise longer stretches of interaction compared to, for example, corrections or even some suggestion sequences (see Extract 7-9). Length of a sequence, however, did not eliminate participants' stances towards asymmetry in epistemic status. Dynamics changed in problem-solving projects, but the problem-solvers still oriented towards the rehearser as the manager of the activity. This is demonstrated in the next section.

8.3.3 Epistemic status in problem-solving

The following extract (8-11) is the continuation of Extract 8-2, during which Laia initiated a suggestion sequence. She had targeted the text on Cristina's PowerPoint slide as being a source of trouble. It is a lengthy project with several sub-projects in which much problem solving activity was carried out. The purpose of including such a long extract is to view the overall structural organization, which shows that though the interactional space has been democratized and all members contribute to the formulation of the phrase they are constructing, it is Cristina, whose slide they are treating, who holds certain rights in the overall management of this course of actions.

Extract 8-11 will therefore be analyzed at a less granular level to describe the overall structure, the management of the tiered moves. The analysis will also compare the general type of interactional patterns seen within a more democratized interactional space, which may arise in a problem-solving environment that was initially enabled by a suggestion sequence.

This long project, an outcome of a suggestion sequence, will be divided into three sub-projects (8-1a, b and c). The first one occupies lines 1-59. During this spate of talk the interactants are searching for an appropriate term (which is actually, *procline*). It begins just after Cristina has taken up Laia's proposal to modify her slide, but she has also undertaken the responsibility for authoring the editing and has just articulated the re-formulation of the sentence. Now Laia is starting to type Cristina's sentence on the computer, which contains the PowerPoint and which is located in front of Laia.

Extract 8-11a

```
1   CRI:    eh put in another
            ((reaches to type))
2           (distal seguramente...)
                    surely
```

((typing))
(3.0)
3 ROS: and with the photogra:aph
(2.0)
4 LAI: (*sí*)
yes
5 ROS: bu- no?
(4.0)
6 CRI: like this
(5.0)
7 LAI: (black beauty)
((all laugh))
8 CRI: to buccal uhm
9 ROS: to [incline?]
10 LAI: [to incline?]
11 ROS: no it's-
12 LAI: no incline no
13 ROS: no
14 LAI: it's to [go]
15 ROS: [ehm]
16 LAI: uh-
17 CRI: tip [tip]
18 ROS: [*però*]
but
19 *sí*
yes
20 LAI: tip?
21 CRI: tip is *inclinació*
inclination
22 LAI: *sí però:ò*
yes but
23 CRI: to proinclinate
24 LAI: to proinclinate
25 ((nods in agreement; points with finger to screen
and looks at Rosa))
26 ((gestures with hand moving forward))
20 *sí*
yes
27 ROS: ((looks at screen))
28 but we only move the crown.
((moves hand forward; looks at Cristina))
29 or [th root to ge-]
30 LAI: [we incline it.]
31 ROS: the root and the crown
32 LAI: the crown [because uh]
27 CRI: [>I think the root<]
28 of the ah# the the crown
29 if you want to move [the root/]
((gestures hand down towards Rosa))
30 LAI: [the problem]
31 of removable [appliances]
32 ROS: [ah]
33 LAI: was that the [that]
34 ROS: [*això*]
that
35 LAI: we only:y-
((gestures forward with hand))
36 CRI: [yes]
37 ROS: [ye::ah]
38 CRI: we need a bracket to move the the root.
((moves hands in one direction; all look at screen))

```
39          s-
40  ROS:    so en [uh]
41  CRI:          [eh]
42          fixed appliances.
43  ROS:    no però inclined? no-
               but
44          ah
45  CRI:    yes
46  ROS:    sí sí °que és°
            yes yes it is
47  CRI:    to proinclinate
48  ROS:    sí sí
            yes yes
49  CRI:    to pro-inclinate
50  ROS:    sí sí
            yes yes
51  CRI:    or pro-incline
52  ROS:    pro-in-
53  CRI:    uh can you search
            ((pointing to computer))
54  ROS:    (inclinate)
55          ((moves to search for the word on the computer))
56          ((seventeen lines omitted while Rosa searches for pro-
            incline on the computer))
57  ROS:    to pro-incline
58          it's correct?
59  CRI:    sí
            yes
```

It was Laia, who had drawn the group's attention to a potential source of trouble, and had put forward the idea of modifying the slide text (Extract 8-2). Yet it is Cristina who actually takes matters into her hands, literally, as she reaches past Laia to start typing the reformulated sentence (line 1). As she types her proposed version of the text, it becomes visible to the others, and they comment on her work. Rosa displays her acceptance with her turn in line 3. She initiate it with an *and* to show she agrees with what Cristina has written and adds her contribution regarding the image on the slide. Laia also shows her agreement with a simple affirmative marker, *yes* (line 4). Cristina draws their attention to what she is writing (line 6) to invite further approval from the others.

In line 8, Cristina starts to say the text aloud, and ends her turn with an *uhm* particle, indicating that her idea for the formulation of the sentence is incomplete. This action is hearable by the others as an invitation to collaborate in the further construction of the sentence. From this point on, they all actively participate in this activity.

To approach the search and formulation of this one term, the participants engage in problem-solving activity, which entails clarifying the meaning of the concept of the term in order to formulate a correct form of the word. They display an understanding that they are looking for a descriptive for a type of tooth position, for which they first indicate *incline* (line 9) as an appropriate term, and then later

the synonym, *tip* (line 17). They add the affix, *pro-* (line 23) to delineate the direction of the inclination.

In line 27, Rosa initiates a request for information regarding the type of tooth movement involved (only the crown or the whole tooth), and the other two co-partcipants provide an explanation to answer to her query. They all reach an agreement on the term *proinclinate* (lines 47-49), when Cristina indicates her uncertainty in this candidate word form by suggesting an alternative, *proincline* (line 51). She requests Rosa to look up the word on her computer (line 53). After a search for this word (not shown in this extract), Rosa seeks confirmation of the appropriateness of the term (*it's correct?,* line 58), to which Cristina confirms affirmatively (line 59).

The interaction emerging in this extract is part of an approximately six-minute project, initiated in Extract 8-2 with a suggestion sequence. It demonstrates very different participation conduct compared to that observed in the other activities analyzed. These interactants are focused on searching for the resources to construct a sentence for Cristina's slide. They are engaged in a situated and collectively targeted goal, which comprises a different type of activity from the rehearsing and the suggestion sequences. Their turns are shorter, delivered with a faster tempo, and fairly equally distributed. They each contribute to the search and orient to collaborative decision-making. This is accomplished by seeking confirmation from each other regarding their candidate word formulations and by assessing, accepting and also contesting the options proposed. The co-participants ask each other questions, and share turns to explicate information. They therefore orient towards each other as having generally equal access to the information they are working with.

The next section of this project (Extract 8-11b) shows the interactants' further construction of this same phrase. Their orientations towards equality in epistemic access to the information and entitlement to shape the formulation of the text from Cristina's slide becomes more evident as seen in their more candid assessments.

Extract 8-11b

60	LAI:	*però*
		but
61		((creases eyes; purses lips; brings hand up, palm outwards))
62		to buccal?
63		to pro-incline?
		((jerks hand around in circular motion))
64		it's very [repetitive]
65	ROS:	[no >no no no<]
66	LAI:	hm
		((raises eyebrows))
67	ROS:	u:uhm
68	CRI:	buccal forces

```
69  LAI:    sí
            yes
            ((typing))
70  CRI:    to in to p- to incline¿
71          and distal or mesial
72  ROS:    not forces no
73          it's the acti- [the spring]
            ((hand jabbing towards the computer))
74  CRI:                   [the direction]
75  ROS:    [buccal spring to proincline?]
76  CRI:    [yes but the direction of the forces]
77          yes
78  LAI:    it's the direction of the force
79          buccal? distal? or mesial.
            ((hand gestures punctuating each word))
80  ROS:    yeah yeah but
81  CRI:    buccal direction¿
82          .hhh
            ((typing))
            (4.0)
83          of the spring
            ((looks at Rosa))
84  ROS:    yeah
85  CRI:    but i#  i# tch i# think
86          i don't have to put it
87  ROS:    okay
88  ROS:    buccal direction to pro-incline?
89          and distal or mesial direction¿
90          to:o
            ((moves hands/palms together twice; gazing into distance))
            (4.0)
91  ROS:    ((looks at her computer for word))
92  LAI:    to separate or to [( )]
            ((typing))
93  CRI:                      [(ay )]
94          ( )
95  ROS:    ajuntar
            put together
            ((looking for word))
96  LAI:    [sí ( )]
97  ROS:    [put together]
            ((gesturing with hand to indicate "it's obvious";
            laughing))
98          okay
99  LAI:    distal or mesial ( )
100 ROS:    or get closer
101 CRI:    to join
102 ROS:    get-
103 LAI:    get closer
            ((nods head))
104 CRI:    get vale
                okay
105 LAI:    ((typing))
            (6.0)
106         °vale°
             okay
```

This equally long stretch of talk starts with Laia's strong response to Rosa's request for confirmation regarding the correctness of the term on which they have

decided, *pro-incline*. She initiates her turn with the contrastive marker, *but* (line 60), which is followed by marked embodied actions, as she uses her hand and facial expressions to emphasize her stance. In lines 62 and 63, she states both of the words they have chosen to include in their phrase, each with a rising intonation, and also accompanied with a strong hand gesture. She formulates her negative assessment regarding the style of the phrasing (line 64) as being redundant.

Rosa responds immediately, overlapping Laia's turn with a rushed through agreement with Laia's stance (line 65). Laia further emphasizes her disaffiliative position in line 66 with a token, *hm*, expressed in a higher volume and with facial features indicating disapproval.

Rosa also demonstrates her disagreement using strong actions when she argues against the use of the word, *forces*, in line 72. She prefaces her identified source of trouble with a negative adverb, *not*, and ends her turn with a negative exclamation, *no*. She then announces the terms that she feels are appropriate (line 73). Her stance towards the correctness of her candidate choices is displayed by her affirmative formulation of the utterance (*it's the*) as well as by her hand gesture, and also her raised volume for emphasis, which is also seen in line 75.

By line 88, the issue has been resolved; they show consensus towards the phrasing of this sentence. Rosa is saying their formulation aloud while Laia is typing it. At line 90, Rosa indicates that she cannot complete the sentence for lack of knowledge as she trails off her last word, and uses hand gestures to complete her turn, and her gaze indicates a thinking posture.

A full four seconds pass before she turns to carry out a word search for the needed terms. Laia attempts to supply the words in line 92, but none of them display a knowledge the word for *ajuntar* (line 95). Upon accessing the word in her computer, Rosa announces the term she's found (*put together*) in line 97, and adds another option in line 100 (*get closer*). Cristina proposes another term, *join*, in line 101, but Laia expresses her approval of the second option Rosa announced (line 103). Laia then types in the jointly decided framing of the sentence that they have all worked to construct, and she closes this action with an *okay*-token (line 106).

This extract demonstrates a more symmetrical relationship among the group members as far as making decisions regarding the choice of wording in one participant's text. It not only indicates orientations towards their equality in entitlement to make suggestions about this topic, but also to strongly reject and disagree with them. The displays of disaffiliation also reveal a strong commitment to this project—formulating an appropriate text for their common PowerPoint.

This symmetry of rights to make a decision is also noticeable in their final decision about the term *get closer*. While Rosa and Cristina propose different options, it is finally Laia who acts to determine the choice they will use (line 103), though Cristina still confirms her acceptance of the term in line 104 with an *okay*-token. And after typing in the full phrase, Laia marks the end of this sequence also with an *okay*-token (line 106), an action that is usually performed by the rehearser.

The final leg of this project is shown below in Extract 8-11c. While the problem regarding the construction of the sentence appears to have been solved with Laia's typing it into the PowerPoint slide and also her closing of the sequence, Cristina considers yet another way to express this idea.

Extract 8-11c

```
107  LAI:   [a:ah una cosa]
                 one thing
108  CRI:   [>i can say< either]
109         ((leans forward to look at Rosa; Rosa leans forward to gaze
            directly at each other.))
110         either=
111  ROS:   ((looks at Cristina))
112  CRI:   =to separate
113         o- or_
114         t- ge- get closer¿
115  ROS:   ((raises eyebrows; nods))
116  CRI:   in theory is correct?
117  ROS:   crec que sí
            I believe yes
118         ((turns to her computer to search for the structure))
119  CRI:   ((turns gaze towards Rosa's computer))
120  LAI:   ((continuing to look at the computer screen in front of
            her))
121         >buccal direction to proincline¿<
            ((reading PowerPoint slide))
122         >distal or mesial direction to separa:ate¿<
123         or¿ (.)
124         to get¿ (.)
125         ((typing))
            (3.0)
126         get closer.
127         ((Rosa and Cristina looking at Rosa's computer; Laia
            looking at hers))
            (5.0)
128  LAI:   jo ho posaria aqui a baix
            i would put it down here
129         i ho  expli[ques]
            and you explain it
130  ROS:              [yeah.]
131         porque es en plan
            because it is like
           ((turns to look at Cristina;  Cristina looks at Rosa's
           computer))
132         o tal¿
            either this
           ((moves  hand to her left))
133         o tal.
```

```
            or that
            ((moves hand to her right))
134  CRI:   sí.
            yes
135         surt?
            does it come out
            ((looking at Rosa's computer))
136  ROS:   ((looks at her computer))
137  LAI:   ((turns head towards right shoulder and looks at PowerPoint
            slide))
138  ROS:   sí
            yes
139         tomar o té¿ o café.
            have tea or coffee
140         ((laughs))
141  CRI:   ((looks at central computer))
142         >distal or mesial to separate¿<
143         either to:o_
            ((moves head towards her right))
144  ROS:   ((looks at central computer))
145  CRI:   either to separate¿
            ((moves head to left))
146         or
            ((moves head to her right))
147         to get closer.
148         yes i think it's correct this
149         ((clears throat))
150  LAI:   i'll write it,
151         either to separate or get closer
            ((typing))
152  ROS:   ((looks at her computer))
153  CRI:   or if you don't want to put
154         i- i say it
            ((pushes hand forward palm towards herself))
155  ROS:   ((looks back at central computer))
156  LAI:   it's just a word
            ((looks up and towards Cristina))
157  CRI:   okay
158  LAI:   ((laughs))
159  CRI:   then ehm
160         yes
161  LAI:   okay
162         [screws]
163  CRI:   [the third]
164         the third active element is the screws
```

Cristina introduces another potential modification to the formulation of their sentence by overlapping Laia's turn (line 108), which appears to be an attempt to draw Rosa's and Cristina's attention to a source of trouble. Cristina takes the floor by deploying a louder volume and a rushed-through utterance (Schegloff, 1982) to announce her action (line 108). She proposes an alternative packaging of the idea they have co-constructed. Cristina visibly seeks confirmation of the appropriateness this candidate phrase from Rosa as she positions her body to have a direct gaze with Rosa (line 109). In line 116, Cristina explicitly requests confirmation regarding the accuracy of this formulation.

After Rosa's response with a weak affirmation (*I think*), both Rosa and Cristina display an orientation towards Rosa's search for the structure on Rosa's computer by means of embodied actions (lines 118-119).

During Cristina's and Rosa's preoccupation with their search for the grammatical structure, *either-or*, Laia maintains her attention on the sentence she is typing and reads the text aloud. At line 128, she initiates a suggestion regarding the distribution of the presentation content between the slide's text and the corresponding script, using an *I-would* conditional declarative.

Rosa and Cristina do not respond to Laia's proposal, and continue their search for the grammatical information. Once Rosa announces her findings (lines 138-139), Cristina applies this knowledge to restructure the formulation they had co-constructed previously, reciting it aloud (lines 141-147). In line 148, she announces her acceptance of this newly configured phrase, and provides a positive assessment regarding its accuracy.

Laia responds with a commissive, or an offer (line 150-151). She announces her future action to incorporate this reformulation into the slide. Cristina proposes an alternative action (line 153), which is similar to that which Laia had suggested in lines 128-129. Namely, that she would be willing to leave the text as it is while she saves her new formulation for her spoken script. She prefaces this suggestion with a coordinator, *or*, to indicate another possible action, and then a clause, *if you don't want to put* (write it), which displays mitigation to weaken the imposition that her decision to change the phrase might constitute.

Laia's response (line 156) indicates that this attenuation was hearable. She confirms that the action, or the modification of the sentence, is not problematic by using the phrase, *just a word*, which downgrades the action to a lesser degree of burden, or amount of retyping implied. Her laughter in line 158 also displays a politeness strategy in this potential face-threatening situation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Cristina shows her acceptance of this action in lines 159-160 with a discourse marker, *then*, to show her a link between the previous interaction and her next turn, which is an affirmative confirmation to accept Laia's offer to re-type the phrase. She formulates her confirmation with the word, *yes*, which displays a stronger commitment to this action than, for example, and okay-token acknowledgement.

It is Laia who closes this sequence, in fact the entire project, with an *okay*-token in line 161, and states the title of the next slide, *screws*. Cristina overlaps this turn with an initiation of her reshearsal sequence (line 163), effectively returning the

group to the ongoing activity and participation framework in which Cristina is the presenter again.

This datum, 8-11c, demonstrates interactional features that are not as common in the rest of the data. It reveals a divergence in activities among the three members—Cristina's and Rosa's search on the computer and Laia's further work on the slide. It also highlights the potential role of the computer in the participants' status related to the rights and obligations in decision-making activity. These phenomena are related.

Cristina recruited Rosa in the search for the grammatical information she needed for her candidate re-formulation. Rosa had access to the computer that until now, this group had used to carry out word searches. Cristina had requested such assistance from Rosa in a previous sequence (Extract 8-11a, line 53).

Laia did not involve herself in this search but continued to type on the PowerPoint slide, which was saved and visible on her computer. She did not participate in the interaction between her co-participants related to the search, but she did vocalize the text she was typing, which is a type of self-directed talk (Steinbach Kohler & Thorne, 2011). Steinbach Kohler and Thorne reported that the use of self-directed talk in a group work setting that they analyzed was used to "establish and maintain inersubjectivity, display and ascribe current foci of attention, and to organize their individual and collective actions in mutually recognizable ways" (2011: 88). Laia's deployment of this resource is consistent with these authors' findings, as she recited the text she was typing at the time when Cristina and Rosa had undertaken another project parallel to the one they had all been working on together. This is an indirect maneuver to mobilize a collective central focus on the overall activity, attending to the PowerPoint slide.

Laia eventually aligned (but did not affiliate) with her co-participants' course of actions in line 128 when she proposed leaving the text in the format that they had formulated previously. This is an explicit attempt to re-establish intersubjectivity regarding the task of editing the PowerPoint slide. In this instance she packages her proposal with a conditional (*I would*), which displays mitigation of her directive to influence her colleagues' future actions. It also displays a stance towards this action being contingent on their approval.

Later, after Cristina and Laia had closed their separate problem-solving sequence, Laia offers to re-type the sentence on the slide (lines 150-151) to integrate the new information into the text. In this case, she formats her offer using the future tense, *I will*. She uses no marker to attenuate her declaration as in this case; she is referring to her own action in this case rather than the articulated action being contingent on another's behavior.

At the same time, this formatting also displays her entitlement to carry out this action. She does not ask permission to type the text on Cristina's slide. In fact, Cristina orients towards Laia's entitlement, or towards her occupying a certain decision-making status in regards the undertaking of this action in her turn in line 153 (*if you want*).

All of these actions reveal a status associated with access to the computer. Throughout the overall project, comprising 8-11a, b and c, the interactants have oriented to a certain symmetry in status in their problem-solving endeavors. They have all shown entitlement to propose—though Cristina carried out this action with greater frequency—and to accept and reject them. They have requested information or confirmation from each other. They have also shown a commitment towards their obligation to formulate their collective text in an accurate way and with appropriate style. However, there are some indicators of stances towards asymmetry in the rights related to the management of this project.

A macro-analysis of the overall movements emerging in the project shows evidence of a more democratized participation framework. Nevertheless, displays of stances Cristina, whose presentation part they are treating, can be seen towards as occupying the higher status in regards to entitlement in decisions about the articulation of an element in her epistemic domain.

In general Cristina is the initiator of most of the proposals in this trajectory, even though all of the members contribute in further shaping and constraining the proposals as well as their outcomes. She also explicitly invites the others to participate in the co-construction of her slides text. Though this action also acknowledges the equality in epistemic access to her material, she manages this collaborative behavior. She is also the participant to make the ultimate decision in what will be the final draft of the sentence on the slide at issue. And she also closes the sequence by resuming her rehearsal activity.

Cristina is also the only interactant to make requests for services. Unlike what has been reported for the construction of request sequences, such as the use of pre-sequences, elaborations or greater deployment of mitigation devices, she initiates her requests fairly directly and with minimal mitigation. In Extract 8-11a, line 53, she requests Rosa to look for a term on the computer (*uh can you search*). Her turn is headed by an uh-particle, which indicates hesitancy and that possible a dispreferred action is coming (Schegloff, 2010). She also formulates her request using a can modal, another type of mitigation.

In line 1 of this same extract (Extract 8-11a), however, she uses no form of mitigation in her request to Laia to type something other than a possible hesitance marker, *eh*, to minimally lessen the force of her action (*eh put in another*). She uses the imperative form and accompanies this turn with her embodied action of

reaching over Laia to carry out the action herself. These actions are clear displays of her stance, as well as theirs since they comply with her requests, regarding Cristina's rights to manage this project.

The only time that a participant other than Cristina acts to propose an action regarding the actual writing of the sentence is Laia, who is has been typing the changes that they have all negotiated. She is the recorder of their interaction, so to speak. As mentioned above, Cristina displays a stance towards Laia's entitlement to leave the text as is, which also represents a decision regarding the structure of Cristina's slide. While she is seen to be referring to the actual typing action itself, rather than an authoring activity, she designs her turn to display her stance towards Laia's offer as creating an imposition for her. This orientation differs from her earlier one in Extract 8-11a, Line 1, when she requests Laia to type something using the imperative form, and then reaching over to undertake the typing herself.

The difference in Cristina's actions seen here may be related to the interactional environment that emerged over the course of this long project. While Cristina initiated many proposals, she, as did the others, oriented to the collectiveness of the decision-making during the co-construction of this sentence as they assessed, built on and rejected proposed wordings.

Laia displayed her preference to keep their jointly created sentence intact by means of her sustained and visible focus on the PowerPoint slide, while Rosa and Cristina searched for a grammatical structure. This stance was also hearable in her proposal to maintain the text as it was. The combination of Laia's articulated choice of action and the imposition potentially associated with an offer for her to act, may have made relevant Cristina's show of deference to Laia's rights as both a co-presenter and a participant responsible for typing, or recording, their collaborative work. This was also reflected in the more attenuated request used by Cristina to recruit Rosa's assistance in the search for the grammatical structure in which she was interested.

The use of the computer in this sequence, therefore, may bestow a higher entitlement to the computer keepers. As their participation is recruited to carry out an action, this invites stances towards the imposition such a request may imply. A similar finding was reported by Asmuß and Oshima, in the 2012 study that analyzed proposal sequences emerging within a meeting between a director and his subordinate.

The macro-analysis of this project has demonstrated that a suggestion sequence has the potential to open the interactional space to problem-solving activity towards the co-construction of students' shared academic task. This type of activity engendered more symmetry as seen in the distribution of turns and displays of entitlement related to decision-making behaviors. First of all, Cristina's

invitation to the others' to assist in the solving of this problem displays her orientation to her co-participants' relatively equal epistemic access to the information. This clearly demonstrates that certain rights to act are related to epistemic access in this context.

Furthermore, orientations to a more equally distributed status among the group members may have been partially influenced by the physical labor of typing in the collaboratively authored text. Besides putting another interactant in the position of physically (actively) participating in the co-construction of Cristina's text, such activity necessitated the deployment of a dispreferred action, a request. As discussed previously, the construction of a request can display as well as create certain identities (Mandelbaum, 1996).

In spite of this observably more democratized participation framework, the overall structural organization is managed by the rehearser, the one responsible for articulating this epistemic domain. This datum has shown the complexity and fluidity of the emerging statuses, stances and overall management of the related actions all implicated in an activity that forms part of the co-creation of a shared academic task. Cristina's omni-relevant status as the one responsible for this part—a part that was jointly assigned to her—formed the framework in which the students could maintain progressivity of not only the problem-solving project, but of the main meeting and rehearsal project.

8.4 Discussion

The analyses of the data presented in Chapter 8 have shown several interesting phenomena related with the suggestion sequences emerging throughout the students' meetings. Suggestion activity comprised complex organizational structures and interactional behaviors in their construction. The complexity of these episodes did not, however, constitute a barrier towards achieving collaborative goals. They, in fact, were the mobilizers of the co-construction of their group project.

Suggestion projects during rehearsal activity tended to be located close to the sources of perceived trouble that the co-participants desired to address. The locations of the proposals adumbrated the type of activity towards which the suggester was aiming. However, the packaging of the suggestion initiations also projected a type of action to the suggestee. Suggesters succeeded in shifting the participation frameworks and launching suggestion sequences by effective deployment of a variety of multimodal resources. These practices, such as use of the conditional (*I would*), or a delay in formulating the suggestion, made evident stances towards suggestions as being delicate actions. However, they did not represent obstacles towards collaborative actions.

These sequences revealed stances towards the status of the suggester, or non-rehearser, and suggestee, the rehearser. At the same time, orientations toward entitlement and obligation related to epistemic status were observed. Though these orientations could be seen during rehearsal activity, they were especially influential in the molding of the interactional behavior within suggestion sequences.

These effects were also noted even in long sequences of problem-solving activity that arose from proposals. Status during problem-solving sequences tended to be more equally distributed as contribution from all members came into play. Also, orientations towards status of members' function in the task development were displayed. This was seen in Cristina's interaction with Laia, the 'typer' of the group's PowerPoint. However, the rehearser still maintained entitlement associated with higher status related to her ownership of the domain. Such privileges included making ultimate decisions regarding the outcomes of proposals and closing the suggestion sequences, for example.

At the same time, the rehearsers also oriented to the status of co-presenters in that he or she sought approval of the final decisions. So epistemic status guided the management of the suggestion sequences, but cooperation from all members was important in final decision-making for the final draft of the presentation.

Chapter 9

Other-initiated corrections

9.1 Introduction

Chapter 9 comprises an analysis of epistemic orientations displayed in an other-initiated correction sequence. This relatively short chapter differs from the other chapters, in that it provides an analysis of only one datum. However, the datum does offer an epistemic lens to a sequence that displays similar interactional patterns to those of the suggestion sequences presented in Chapter 8. Therefore, it is of interest to considering contextual features of interactions displaying similar epistemic practices.

9.2 Epistemic status and stances in other-initiated correction activity

The extract presented in this section (Extract 9-1) is a follow up to an earlier suggestion sequence seen in Chapter 8 (Extract 8-8), which showed Tomás and Alex proposing changes to Oscar's presentation script. In the interaction shown in Extract 9-1, Oscar has resumed rehearsing his part when Alex intervenes again to recruit attention to the pronunciation of the word, *ischemic*, which Oscar had mispronounced. Although this type of action does not represent a suggestion sequence, it is a type of directive as Alex is attempting to get Oscar to do something (change his pronunciation of ischemic).

Extract 9-1 could be considered a deviant case of pronunciation correction by another. The related conduct seen in this spate of talk greatly differs from other such sequences observed not only in the other groups also within this particular group's later interactions. Other sequences in which corrections by others arise are much briefer and less complex. The location of the correction is fairly close to the mispronounced word. The recipient usually takes up the correction immediately by repeating the word with a corrected pronunciation, and then rapidly resumes rehearsal activity. Examples of these types of sequences can be seen in Chapter 5 (Extracts 5-16, 5-17 and 5-18).

In the following extract, the participant marked, *COM*, represents an emission by Alex's computer. He is accessing the pronunciation of the word, ischemic from the website, Howjsay.com.

Extract 9-1

```
1 OSC:      (after) we talked about pain¿
2           e:ehm the next slide e:ehm
3           talks about the source of pain.
4           well usually e:ehm (1s)
5           eh the source of pain
6           may variate eh
```

depending on which area of the tooth
is receiving (.) more or less forces. (1s)
((4 lines removed))
therefore eh we can find
some ischemic ((/aiskimɪK/)) areas
((8 lines removed))
the next e:eh step
would be a pulpitis
COM: [ischemic]
OSC: [but pressure] has to be really high
(or relative)e:eh has e:eh pulpitis
after receiving orthodontic (pressure)
COM: ischemic
ALE: [tch .hhh]
((bites his lips))
OSC: [pain] eh is usually directly proportional
to the force applied
this is logical
because the more force you apply to a tooth
the more eh the (periodontal) ligament (suffers)
and therefore (xxx)
might
((nods head))
be avoided
COM: ischemic
ALE: .hhh how did you say
the:e the:e (1s)
isquémia
ischemia
we say in spanish
how did you pronounce it¿
OSC: /aiskimɪk/
ALE: [/aiskimɪk/]
TOM: [°/aiskimɪk/°]
COM: ischemic
TOM: ((slightly creases eyes))
ALE: cause in:n (.)
well i just looked it up
OSC: ((laterally girates head upwards; creases eyes))
ALE: cause i didn't either know how to:o (.)
pronounce it
a:and th[e howjsay u:uh]
TOM: [°/aiski/- /aiski/-°]
/aiskim/-
i would say /aiskimik/ too
COM: ischemic
ALE: uhh# the howjsay website says (.)
ischemic ((/ɪskimɪk/))
OSC: (ischemic)
ALE: yeah i- i don't know
((widens eyes; tightly shakes his head 'no'))
i didn't know how to pronounce it either
so I just looked it up¿
and maybe
i don't know if you can hear it
one sec
((tapping noise; whirring computer noise))
so (.)
this is what the website (.) says
((clicking noise of the computer))
COM: ischemic

```
66 OSC:     ischemic (fine)
67 TOM:     ischemic
            ((backs away from screen))
68          >okay fine<
69          ((some lines seem to be cut out))
70 ALE:     just that
71          I think the the pace was fine
72          and oscar really explained things
73          that weren't in the:e (.)
74          in the slide
75          so it was great
76          (1.5)
77 OSC:     next topic is pain relief.
```

This extract constitutes the longest correction project that emerged in all of the data collected. Oscar uses the term, *ischemic*, in line 12, but Alex does not address Oscar's mispronunciation of this word until over twenty lines later (in line 32). In line 15, a voice originating from the Alex's computer, or the website, Howjsay.com, is discernible, pronouncing the word, ischemic. Oscar continues, and Alex plays the word again in line 19. He then appears to initiate a turn, overlapping Oscar's rehearsal, but he stops to cede the floor to Oscar. After a third playing of the word (lines 31-36), Alex finally recruits Oscar's attention to the word of interest as well as to Oscar's pronunciation of it. He does this by means of a request for information about the pronunciation and withholds his own use of the word in English, code-switching to say it (Line 34).

Oscar complies by repeating the word, *ischemia* (line 37). Both Alex and Tomás repeat his version of the word. He displays no uncertainty about his pronunciation, and the other co-participants repeat his version of the pronunciation of ischemic. Alex plays the word again (line 40). Tomás slightly creases his eyes, indicating a thinking stance, or focus attention to the task at hand.

In line 42, Alex initiates an account for his action; he refers to his source of authority in the matter (*I just looked it up*) and then indicates the reason for his search by claiming insufficient knowledge regarding the pronunciation (lines 45-46), thereby displaying solidarity to Oscar's situation. In line 47, he names the source he employed to access this knowledge (Howjsay.com).

Tomás also displays either doubt regarding Alex's suggestion or possibly also solidarity to Oscar's position in this correction sequence. In lines 48-49 he is seen repeating the word in self-directed talk. In line 50, he affirms that his pronunciation of *ischemic* would align with Oscar's. These actions display an orientation towards the existence of two versions of one pronunciation, Alex's suggested pronunciation and the one of which the other two interactants have exhibited an understanding.

Alex plays the word again in lines 51 and 53 while referring to the website from

which the pronunciation of the word is heard. In lines 55-56), he reiterates in a slightly emphatic way that he had also shared his co-partners' epistemic status regarding this item, which accounts for his word searching activity (line 57). To support his claim, he manipulates his computer, so that the others may hear the website more clearly (lines 60-65).

In line 65, Oscar repeats the pronunciation hearable from Alex's computer and immediately confirms his acceptance thereof. Tomás proceeds in the same manner as seen in lines 67-68.

Just following Oscar's and Tomas´ concede to the pronunciation for *ischemic*, and in so doing, to Alex's correction, it seems that some interaction might have been lost to technical problems. It is not clear if this occurred or if so, how much was lost. However, the interaction seen from lines 70 through 77 emerged within this same participation framework that had been opened to address Oscar's pronunciation issue as when he resumes his rehearsing, he introduces the slide that follows the topic he had been treating.

Of special interest in this last move of the extract is Alex's actions and orientation towards Oscar's status as a presenter. He is positively assessing Oscar's performance. It is important to remember that this stretch of talk occurred after Alex's previous suggestion regarding the pace and organization of the presentation. In Extract 8-8, Alex had negatively assessed the performance until that moment and had specifically made reference to the excessively fast pace of the delivery. He had also suggested that they explicate content *beyond what is…written in each slide*.

Alex initiates this sequence with a mitigating device (*just that*, line 70), perhaps referring to his final action of commenting about the performance. He starts his assessment with an evidential, I think, indicating the type of action that follows will be his opinion. He lists the aspects of Oscar's performance that he felt he had carried out appropriately (his pace and also his explanation, in lines 71-74); in line 75, Alex links these actions to his global assessment, for which he uses an emphatic positive term (*great*). After a short delay, Oscar resumes his rehearsing.

This trajectory reveals a level of complexity on par with that of a directive, and therefore, diverges from the type of conduct seen in the majority of correction activity observed in all of the data. Alex delayed his correction, and also quite possibly tried to pre-empt his correction action by playing the Howjsay.com version of the term with a sufficiently loud volume and frequency for Oscar to hear for himself, and in turn, self-correct. After all, his computer could be heard in the recording.

When Alex did initiate his explicit correction sequence, he carried out a pre-

correction turn by requesting information about Oscar's previous pronunciation of the term in question. This action signaled attention to a source of trouble as well as the type of trouble. However, Oscar did not initiate a self-correction, or demonstrate a stance that his pronunciation of the word to which Alex was enlisting his attention was inappropriate. Thus, he positioned himself as a knower, and Alex's question positioned him as an unknowing participant.

In two different turns (lines 42-46 and 55-57), Alex offered an account for his actions as a result of his lack of knowledge about this topic, thereby referring to an epistemic status that was relatively equal to Oscar's. The second turn was more emphatically performed, and this may be in response to Tomás' display of uncertainty regarding Alex's proposed correction.

Alex finally offers evidence to support his correction in lines 60 through 65, which his co-participants are heard to accept (lines 66 and 67). They both repeat the pronunciation they hear, and assess this adjusted pronunciation as being appropriate. These actions are done swiftly, and in Tomás' case, physically abruptly as he moves his body away from the screen. They do not utter a change-of-state token, but merely display their agreement regarding the correctness of the term.

Such displays may not have represented a sufficiently affiliative stance for Alex as he ends the sequence with a compliment regarding Oscar's performance. He formulates his positive assessment in terms of Oscar's having complied with the suggested conduct that Alex had previously described. In no other sequence of the data collected for this study is there an example of a positive assessment about another peer's performance. At most, there are cases of back-channeling practices to indicate that the rehearser should continue, or that no problem has been perceived to warrant repair or correction. The location of this sequence may suggest that the accumulation of proposals (at least two in extract 8-8) in addition to the correction in the extract above may have made relevant a mitigating action by Alex.

As stated earlier, the vast majority of correction-by-other sequences observed in the data for this present study were unlike suggestion trajectories in terms of level of complexity. The data show correctees' readily accepting the correction as well as the correcting action by another. Findings in Devos' (2016) study revealed that much less attention being dedicated to language corrections or issues among peers in a CLIL setting than that dedicated to negotiation and management of content-related problems.

The type of interactional patterns seen in the other correction projects might exhibit an orientation to there existing a single correct version of a pronunciation, which may eliminate any perceived need to debate a preferred variation. An

orientation to the availability of different options as a shaping and constraining phenomenon in the construction of suggestion sequences has been reported in (Mandelbaum, 1996). In this extract both Oscar's confidence displayed towards his own pronunciation (line 37) and also Tomás' topicalization of his own stance toward this same pronunciation (line 50) indicate attitudes towards there being more than a one version of this item—whether or not there in fact exist various pronunciations of ischemic—or that their version is, in fact, correct. Such conduct serves to highlight a feature of suggestion sequences that renders them complex interactions.

9.3 Summary

Interaction seen in Extract 9-1 was comparable in behavior to a directive-type, or suggestion, trajectory. Alex used prefatory organization and mitigating resources, which adumbrated a dispreferred action. He also gave accounts for his behavior, and referred to an outside authority to validate his proposed 'correct' pronunciation. His conduct along with Tomás' seeming resistance to Alex's actions made this normally simple project as laborious as one in which a suggestion is constructed.

Summary of Analysis Part 2

The chapters in Analysis Part 2 have provided a window into the interactions of students as they carry work together to complete a group assignment. They bring to the forefront the inner workings and dynamics of collaborative processes. This is seen through the organization of the types of activity in which the students engaged.

The students interpreted the meeting time as a space for rehearsal and also editing their presentation. The relationship between the two main activities, seen in rehearsing and non-rehearsing sequences, reveals the orientations and actions that shape and constrain the collectiveness of this type of assignment.

The rehearsing activity represented a general framework of the presentation itself. It comprised work that each member had developed individually, the PowerPoint slides and accompanying script. It also made visible the structure of the presentation that the students had developed together previously. Therefore, both elements of group work, individually and jointly created material, open for examination.

The collectively produced structure of the presentation served as a guide for the rehearsal activity. It also rendered such activity and rehearsing interaction predictable. Progressivity towards accomplishing the meeting goals was contingent on finishing the rehearsal of the PowerPoint. When students broke away from this activity to carry out other business at hand, they also later returned to the presentation structure. The presentation outline further guided participants as to when this breaking away should occur. If the rehearsing was interrupted, the students oriented towards the end of a PowerPoint slide or subtopic as an appropriate TRP.

During rehearsal activity, the speaker displayed orientations towards the type of behavior that is appropriate for delivering an oral presentation. The co-presenters coordinated their behaviors to project their alignment with this type of participation framework. The speaker was given the floor; the participants mainly looked at the computer screen/PowerPoint slides or the speaker as the object of their attention (See Extracts 7-1 and 7-2). If another, unexpected activity was carried out while the speaker was performing, surprise could be displayed (Extract 7-3).

Though there was stability in the PowerPoint artifact, as it represented

a 'hard copy' of their work, the meeting event itself afforded a new and emerging environment. Therefore, students' experience with the work developed thus far was unfamiliar. The novelty of this interactional space added to the rough draft status of their project. This context made editing activity, non-rehearsal participation frameworks, relevant.

There was a stark difference between the conduct observed in rehearsing and non-rehearsing activity. Non-rehearsing activity comprised more complex interaction as it required a recruitment of attention from the speaker, and also co-participant. Once this was achieved, the interrupter projected the goal of his or her actions through more complex courses of actions. This activity was not as predictable as was the rehearsing one, and it tended to democratize the interactional space. Therefore, more students participated in the interaction.

The non-rehearsing activity that emerged during rehearsing tended to comprise suggestion sequences. These sequences were usually linked to, and located near, sources of trouble, or objects the suggester's deemed as editable. It was in suggestion courses of action that agency was observable, which in turn also made visible the possibility of alternative versions of the presentation. The presence of other options creates a fertile context for suggestion-making.

As mentioned above, interruptions were not seen as expected behaviors during rehearsal activity. They were not part of the script. However, they were also not negatively sanctioned. This may be partially due to the careful construction of these intervening sequences by the suggesters.

Suggestion sequences were accomplished with complex structuring as seen in data presented Chapter 8, Section 8.2. They were oriented to as delicates in that they often comprised prefaces (pre-suggestion actions), mitigating resources (use of *could* or *would*, for example) and accounts. These actions highlighted general stances towards the imposition that a suggestion or proposal may represent, like is seen in many directive-anchored sequences (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2). At the same time, they revealed orientations towards status. In this situation, one type of status to which the participants oriented was epistemic status.

Orientations towards epistemic status were already observable in the

rehearsing activity as seen in data presented in Chapter 7, in Section 7.2. The non-rehearsers oriented to rehearsers' rights to hold the floor as they displayed their knowledge by means of explaining the content that they were responsible for knowing. But this status was also seen throughout the non-rehearsing activity as was seen in Extracts analyzed in Chapter 8 and also Chapter 9.

Epistemic stances were seen in the bid for the floor, for example by means of known-answer questions. They were also seen in the proposal projects, which were managed by the rehearser. Rehearser status entailed ratifying the final decisions after problem-solving activity, and closing the suggestion sequences. These projects were shaped and constrained by stances towards entitlement and obligations related to epistemic status. This was so even in a deviant correction sequence.

However, the participants also oriented to the collaborative nature of the meeting tasks and group project assignment. The non-rehearsers were able to access a more equal status by means of complex suggestion sequences. Even though the reigns of these sequences were visibly held by the rehearsers, the rehearsers also displayed cooperative attitudes in proposal activity. Confirmation by their co-participants for their decisions were usually sought.

This unfolding context in which rehearsing and non-reheasing activity emerged led to interesting relationships and participation frameworks. There was an unstable balance between rehearser status and non-rehearser or co-presenter status. This data analysis revealed the dynamic nature of this balance, which was particularly evident in suggestion sequences. The rehearsal of the presentation marked progressivity of the meeting task as well as the end-product of the students' work. Suggestion sequences mobilized co-construction activity to make them modify their presentation, making it a living work and transforming it into one belonging to all of the group.

Analysis Part 3
Opportunities for learning

Notes on the structure of Analysis Part 3

Part 3 of the analysis is distinct from the previous two in different ways. Firstly, it contains only one chapter. Furthermore, the analyses of this chapter of the thesis focus on developmental possibilities of the same interactions presented in previous chapters.

In this chapter (Chapter 10), the suggestion sequences, as well as two correction sequences seen in previous chapters, will be revisited and analyzed to examine them more closely for potential learning opportunities that may co-occur within these contexts. This is not to say that learning opportunities were not a feature of the previous analyses; however, they were not the main focus of the discussion. Learning activity here will mainly be conceptualized in terms of scaffolding behaviors, which in turn links back to the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as a framework for conceptualizing developmental possibilities.

Though the analysis focuses on interactional patterns in the collaborative construction of scaffolding activity, descriptions of scaffolding actions will mostly draw from classifications reported in Wood et al. (1976), as well as in Tharp and Gallimore (1988), both discussed in the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2. The use of these descriptive frameworks, however, was posterior to the conversational analysis of the data, not a simple application of a theory external to the interaction.

Analysis Part 3 aims to answer questions outlined in Chapter 1 (Section 1.11) and related to Objective 2. This objective was *to explore whether the activities in which the students engage during their task meetings afford learning opportunities towards the students' co-construction of language and content knowledge*. More specifically, Chapter 10 seeks to answer questions related to *what type of collaborative learning opportunities, if any, are present in a setting in which a teacher is not physically present*. These questions were formulated as: 1.) *How are learning opportunities oriented to by interactants in the course of their unfolding activities? ;* 2.) *What types of interactional sequences are more conducive to learning-type behavior?* and 3.) *How do learners coordinate their actions in such a way as to facilitate learning-type behavior*

Chapter 10

Scaffolding behavior

10.1 Introduction

Chapter 10 is divided into six sections. Section 10.2 provides a general analysis of scaffolding behaviors observed in some of the suggestion sequences seen in previous chapters. Section 10.3 presents an analysis of data in which layered scaffolding sequences emerging within scaffolding sequences already in progress. Data demonstrating collaborative scaffolding practices are analyzed in Section 10.4, and in Section 10.5 participants' use of tools for scaffolding is examined. In Section 10.6, a summary of this chapter is presented.

10.2 Scaffolding behavior in suggestion sequences

The following extract was seen in Chapter 7 (Extract 7-13). This sequence arguably represents fairly traditionally conceived scaffolding conduct as defined by Wood et al. (1976) and Tharp and Gallimore (1988). This activity can be observed in the sequence initiated by Cristina to make a suggestion regarding the organization of Laia's script.

Extract 10-1

1	LAI:	an anterior bite ↓↑planes .ah
2	CRI:	how many:y (.)
		((Laia looks at Cristina))
3		plates we have.
4		(0.7) five
5	LAI:	(0.7)anterior, posterior, incli:ined¿ (1.6)
		((listing using fingers for each 'plane'))
6		a:and with lingual [(fins.)]
7	CRI:	[yes]
8		s- and you can introduce (xxx)
9		we ↑ha:ave
		((punctuates with hand gestures; looking at Laia))
10	LAI:	((nods))
11	CRI:	°(and ↑fo[ur])°
12	LAI:	o[kay]
13	CRI:	no?
14	LAI:	so we ↑have
15		(1.5)
		((places hand on her chin; smiles))
16		*ahora me he pasado*
		now i've gone too far
17		((Crisina smiles; Rosa laughs))
18		*como si hhh yo te-*
		as if i ha-

```
19          yo tengo tres pis↑cinas.[1]
            i have three swimming pools
20          ((laughing))
21          a veure
            let's see
22          hem dit anterior inclined posterior
            we have said
            ((lists with fingers))
23          and# (.) with# fins#
24          sí no?
            yes no ((right?))
25 ROS:     sí.
            yes
            ((nods her head))
26 LAI:     so we have four planes.
```

In Extract 10-1, Cristina perceives a source of trouble in Laia's emerging execution of the rehearsing task. It is important to note that in these analyses a reference to the source of trouble that will be discussed are emically treated. In other words, they are referred to as displayed orientations by the suggester to the action as trouble, rather than as an a priori categorization of trouble.

Cristina targets Laia's organization of her script, or the content she is presenting, as can be seen in her suggestion to introduce Laia's part in another manner (lines 8-9 and 11). As was seen in Chapter 7, Cristina does not simply inform Laia that she has detected a problem, nor does she identify the type of problem she has discerned. She does not request an editing action from Laia. She assists Laia in achieving all of these actions through scaffolding behavior that will be unpacked in the following paragraphs.

In line 2, Cristina enlists Laia's attention by asking her a question related to an aspect of her content. She uses a known-answer question as a device to elicit the information from Laia, and waits for Laia's answer, as can be seen in her delays between turns (lines 4 and 5). She offers a candidate response in line 4, which could be seen to encourage or pursue a response from Laia.

Laia does not provide an immediate answer to Cristina's question. She calculates the answer by listing the number of planes, in order to determine how many of them there are (lines 5-6). Cristina confirms Laia's answer to be acceptable (line 7).

Once Laia has accomplished the action that Cristina has set up for her, or has answered Cristina's question, Cristina formulates her suggested modification to Laia's script by using quoted speech (lines 9 and 11) to model an alternative way to present her content.

[1] Possible reference to a popular YouTube video that showed a woman saying that she had three swimming pools, but actually holding up four fingers to accompany her utterance.

Though Laia's acceptance of Cristina's suggestion can be seen through her actions of nodding (line 10) and her *okay*-token (line 12), Cristina deploys a polar interrogative (line 13) to recruit Laia's confirmation, and in so doing also displays her orientation towards Laia's entitlement to have the final say in the application of her suggestion. Such a mitigating action demonstrates a stance towards the possible face-threatening nature that this directive, or proposal, could represent for Laia. Furthermore, it also places the final undertaking of her proposed change in the hands of Laia.

Laia shows her acceptance of Cristina's proposal by taking it up (line 14) when she resumes her rehearsing. However, she displays uncertainty and confusion when attempting to incorporate this additional information into her presentation, as can be seen in line 15 (a delay and embodied actions). She announces the cause of her inability to continue (line 16), referring to uncertainty in how many planes she had calculated (as seen in lines 5 and 6). She refers to her confusion in a humorous manner by invoking another scenario, which depicted a disparity in talk and calculation (line 18-19).

In line 21, Laia orients to the task of problem-solving (*let's see*). She approaches the problem, without assistance this time, and using the same calculation process she carried out earlier (lines 5-6) in response to Cristina's question. She re-counts the planes, listing them again with her fingers. After Laia's previous counting activity, Cristina had self-selected to confirm Laia's actions, but this time Laia seeks confirmation from others that her calculation is accurate. It is Rosa who offers the confirmation, and not Cristina, who initially drew attention to the problem. Laia then closes this sequence by continuing her rehearsal, embedding the information she has accessed herself.

Cristina's scaffolding conduct, therefore, not only led to Laia's final achievement of an editing action, but it also provided a scaffold for self-regulation in the solving of a problem that arose in the actual application of Cristina's suggestion. Essentially, the actions seen over this sequence represent a change in Laia's behavior or performance of her rehearsal, thereby making the scaffolding process visible.

This extract reveals a complex interaction during which scaffolding behaviors were collaboratively achieved within an unfolding shared task among peers. Cristina's scaffolding-like practices were based on Laia's ZPD; she guided Laia towards drawing from their shared knowledge and abilities to carry out actions.

There are different layers of tasks that Cristina helped Laia accomplish. At a more macro-level, there is the ongoing rehearsal task, which Cristina was attempting to assist Laia in carrying out or organizing. There was also the construction of the editing task itself, which represented assisting Laia in the modification of her

script. At a micro-level of the interaction Cristina aimed at securing Laia's understanding or perceiving of the problem packaged in a way so as to allow Laia to solve the problem herself. To carry out the editing and ultimately, the rehearsal task, Cristina assisted Laia in accomplishing first the task of attending to the problem.

In the work towards the accomplishment of directing Laia's attention to an aspect of a source of trouble, Cristina's used a known-answer question to guide Laia. She did this rather than merely suggesting there was a problem or explicitly identifying one or even simply correcting her. Using Wood et al.'s (1976) classification, we could then say that Cristina recruited Laia's interest. She simplified the task by focusing on one specific aspect of the problem—Laia answered a question rather than explore all possible ways to re-structure her problematic script. Cristina also maintained the interactional space in which Laia could answer the question, so she encouraged Laia to stay on track with this task. She modeled a candidate version of how a 'better' script might appear. Furthermore, she managed affective dimension of this process by means of a polar interrogative to display a cooperative stance and deferment to Laia's status.

Cristina's scaffold also extended to recruiting Rosa's participation. In the later problem-solving sequence, when Laia attended to the problem herself using the same scaffold actions that Cristina had introduced, Rosa offers assistance through her response to Laia's request for confirmation regarding her performance. This feedback, which is an element listed in Tharp and Gallimore's (1988: 44) classification, makes relevant Laia's closing of the sequence in order to eventually carry out the final version of the edited object, or to achieve the task.

Another extract that demonstrates the use of a known-answer question to initiate a suggestion, and in turn, scaffolding sequence is taken from the interaction between Alex, Omar and Tomás, which was also seen in Chapter 8 (Extract 8-1).

Extract 10-2

```
1 TOM:      so:o then you can- (.2) move the:e (.) tooth
2           more easily.
3 ALE:      is it a cut only in the:e gingival tissue?
4           or >does it go< right through the bone.
5 TOM:      >it goes right through the [bone]<
6 ALE:                                 [okay]
7 TOM:      you can do the cut like in the geniva
8           ((gingiva))
9           a:nd go through the bone
10          or (xxx)
11          [(xxx)            ]
12 ALE:     [okay. cause you:u]
13          you made a difference between cutting the bone
14          and then you said (yeh/ yet)
15          you only cut the gingival tissue
16 TOM:     ah [okay]
```

```
17 ALE:        [so:o] okay
18          just that
19          I mean (.)
20   →      just as a sug[gestion]
21 TOM:                  [no it-]
22          it depends on if
23          (either) you do a flap o:or
24 ALE:     >okay °okay°< (.2)
25 TOM:     u:uhm well
26          one of the most im-
27          most important thing to know
28          about the:e corticotomy
29          is the:e (.) phenomenon
30          that (it) is produced
31          which is called r a p
32          in Spanish it's rap
```

The source of trouble that Alex is concerned with is related to the accuracy or consistency of Tomás' presentation, as is made visible in his reference to the disparity in information that Tomás explicated in two different instances (lines 12-15). Like Cristina, Alex uses a known-answer question to initiate the sequence (line 3-4). His question is formulated as an alternative type of question, which makes relevant a specific type of response, or one of the two options that Alex has articulated.

Tomás aligns with Alex's action by repeating one of the alternative responses that Alex provided, word for word (line 5). However, although Alex has displayed his acceptance of this answer, Tomás self-selects to expand his answer, thereby re-formulating the content in his own way, and positioning himself as the manager of the sequence and as the person responsible for knowing this topic.

In lines 12-15, Alex attempts to restore intersubjectivity by providing an account for his initial question. He draws Tomás' attention to the trouble source he had noted, namely that Tomás had presented conflicting information. Tomás indicates his change of state in his understanding and acceptance of Alex's actions (*ah okay*, in line 16). But he does not indicate that he will change his script, or take up Alex's yet unsaid proposal to modify his presentation.

Alex initiates a sequence that first projects a dispreferred action in line 17, or an upcoming proposal to address the problem that he has articulated. He, however, abandons this trajectory and instead uses a formulation to refer to his action as being a suggestion (line 20).

Alex's withholding of a candidate 'solution' of the problem that he identified, as well as downgrading the strength of his directive to *just* a suggestion, makes it relevant for Tomás to accept or reject Alex's stance that trouble exists, as well as indicate whether he will offer to change his script. Tomás does not affiliate with Alex's understanding that there was a discrepancy in his material. He instead

accounts for his version of the content presentation by providing information that contextualizes or clarifies his script (lines 21-23). Alex hastily accepts Tomás' explanation, and Tomás resumes his rehearsing.

Scaffolding activity is observable in Alex's action in his project that he initiated to recruit Tomás' attention to a problem and also to suggest a modification of his presentation. Similar to Extract 10-1, a question is used to enlist Tomás' attention and understanding of a problem. He does not initially 'spell it out' for him, but gives space for Tomás to reach this understanding on his own by using his own knowledge toward this end. His alternative question not only targets an element that Alex believes forms part of the trouble, but it also reduces the number of options that Tomás may choose from in order to answer the question. These actions could be related to items 1 and 2—recruitment and reduction of degrees of freedom—in Wood et al.'s (1976) classification of scaffolding (see Chapter 2).

When Tomás does not acknowledge the trouble source for which Alex is aiming, Alex explicitly states the discrepancy he had observed. This action could be seen as scaffolding behavior as described in item 4 in Wood et al's descriptors—marking critical features—of the problem-solving process, "like providing information about the discrepancy between what the child has produced and the ideal solution" (1976: 98). In this case, Alex pointed out the discrepancy he observed between what Tomás had said during his rehearsal, and what he was saying in response to his question. His assistance arose from Tomás' inability to achieve intersubjectivity, or with Alex's attention to a trouble source. Alex's assistance was contingent on Tomás' performance.

The behaviors revealed in this interaction assisted Tomás in achieving various tasks. First intersubjectivity with Alex regarding the identity of a problem was accomplished through Alex's question. Secondly, though Tomás did not explicitly accept Alex's suggestion that there was a discrepancy or a problem in his script, by offering an account for his disagreement, he actually did achieve modifying his rehearsal task with the support of Alex's actions. He re-cast the formulation of his script to include supplementary material, to render his presentation more comprehensible. We do not see here if he incorporated this change into his final presentation, but his understanding of the problem led to changes in the execution of his task.

Scaffolding activity in this extract was less uni-directional than that seen in Extract 10-1. Tomás' participation contributed more actively in the construction of Alex's scaffolding actions. Although scaffolding is considered to be a dynamic, multi-directional and emergent activity from a socio-interactionist perspective, Laia's actions indicated a more compliant stance towards Cristina's proposal. Tomás' need for clarification, and then his seeming disaffiliation with Alex's

proposal, led to more complex interaction to achieve the co-construction of the task at hand.

Yet another example of the use of a known-answer question to achieve intersubjectivity regarding suggested treatment of a problem, is seen again in Laia, Cristina and Rosa's group work. This extract was seen in Chapter 7 (Extract 7-12).

Extract 10-3

```
1   CRI:    or mesial direction. (.)
2           it depends o- on the im:m e:eh (xxx)
3   LAI:    ((creases brow; raises gaze from screen to look at Cristina))
4           when-
5   CRI:    ((looks at Laia))
6   LAI:    when we use °springs ↓↑°Cristina°.
7   CRI:    >eh uh- when we have a
8           for example a di-
9           a diastema¿<
10          and we and we=
11   LAI:    =want to close it
            ((hands closing together; both look at slide))
12   CRI:   yes.
13   ROS:   ((nods))
14   CRI:   and we can an- we
15          but [it's different but]
16   LAI:       [i would put it here]
17   CRI:   because distal and mesial are for diastemas
            ((looks at Laia; pushes hands towards each other))
18          or to create the spaces
            ((gestures with hands moving away from each other))
19          an- an- .hh[buccal is to]
20   ROS:              [buccal is to]
            ((both gesture with hands moving forward and look at Laia))
21   CRI:   proincline to tip o:or
22   LAI:   I would put it here
            ((all look at PowerPoint slide))
23          to buccal in order to incline¿
            ((gestures forward direction with hand))
24          distal or mesial in order to separate.
            ((looks at Cristina; moves hands away from each other))
25   CRI:   sepa[rate¿]
            ((Rosa and Cristina look at Laia))
26   LAI:       [or eh]
27   CRI:   or e:hh
            ((moves hands together))
28          put together
            ((all look at slide))
```

In line 3, Laia makes a bid for the floor—and gains it—by uttering the first word of her question (*when*, line 3). As was seen in Extracts 10-1 and 10-2, her known-answer question achieves a focus on an element of Cristina's content organization that she would like to modify, which is later seen in her suggestion formulated in lines 16 and 22.

Cristina reformulates the explanation of her content in response to Laia's question. In this way, Laia's actions, or known-answer question (like the very ones Cristina

herself had performed in Extract 10-1), allow Cristina to achieve steps to the next level of Laia's scaffold, which is to modify her script by re-sequencing the information in Cristina's text.

In line 19, perturbation is observable in Cristina's continuing explication in response to Laia's question. At this point, Rosa offers assistance by co-completing her turn with overlapping talk, and also similar embodied actions with their gaze and hand gestures. Until this moment, Rosa has not spoken, but upon signs of Cristina's faltering, Rosa supports Cristina's achievement of her explanation with collaborative turn-taking (Lerner, 2004). Her assistance is temporary; she does not attempt to take the floor, but displays an orientation to this turn as belonging to Cristina, which she ultimately achieves in completing on her own.

In line 22, Laia is able to fully articulate her suggestion that she had attempted in line 16. She formulates her action as a proposal with the use of an *I-would* statement to outline the type of action she is proposing, and then uses quoted speech to provide a candidate alternative to Cristina's original slide content.

The locations of Laia's suggestions would indicate that her proposed modification is based on, or a result of, Cristina's explanations, which were a response to the question Laia had posed (line 6). Laia did not identify a source of trouble in this sequence, but she guides Cristina to accomplish an explicative process. This eventually leads the talk to the area of the presentation that Laia would like to address. In other words, Laia does not simply announce that she would like to change Cristina's text. She helps Cristina reach a space where Laia can model the type of behavior she thinks would be appropriate in carrying out the task at hand.

What is particularly interesting in this extract is the counter scaffolding action that Cristina carries out in line 25. Cristina repeats the last word of Laia's candidate text and uses a rising intonation to indicate that her version is not complete. Laia displays her understanding of Cristina's action and initiates a corrected version, which projects her intention to add information (line 26). Cristina, however, completes Laia's turn with the missing phrase (put together, line 28), and also hand gestures to further facilitate her meaning.

This datum revealed similar scaffolding activity that was visible in the previous two extracts (10-1 and 10-2). It further demonstrated other aspects of scaffolding seen in a multi-party group work situation. Participation by a third group member was seen in the support of a peer's achievement of a task with Rosa's collaborative turn-taking conduct. Furthermore, the scaffolding actions seen in this spate of talk were multi-directional. Laia's support in the form of modeling an 'appropriate' behavior to achieve editing of Cristina's test gave rise to Cristina's scaffolding actions. In her turn, Cristina marked critical features of the task by repeating and

using prosodic resources to indicate the part of Laia's sentence that she felt needed treatment. She did not, for example, complete the turn for Laia until after Laia initiated an attempt to do so.

10.3 Scaffolding within scaffolding

Extracts 10-1, 10-2 and 10-3 have shown scaffolding behavior that facilitated intersubjectivity regarding a source of trouble and possible solutions. In the following extract, the attention to a source of trouble is more explicit. There are no prefatory actions leading up to the suggestion sequence. In this datum, seen in Chapter 8 (Extract 8-9), Tomás suggests a change for Alex's script as he rehearses it.

Extract 10-4

```
1  ALE:    so the bone basically starts to grow
2          from the yellow lines¿
3          in the direction of the blue lines. (.)
4          until they meet in the center¿
5          and the suture is closed again (.)
6          .hhh [u:uh ]
7  TOM:         [i wou-] i would (comment here) that
8          once that the suture is closed¿
9          we can:not expand or reduce (it [uh)]
10 ALE:                                    [okay]
11         okay
12 TOM:    widen the:e
13 ALE:    okay
14 OSC:    [yeah]
15 TOM:    [the:e] >maxilla<
16 OSC:    that's why ehm (.)
17         trying to expand e:eh the maxillary bone¿
18         we:e try to do it when the patient is young
19         because the amount of e:eh (.) growth
20         that we can create or generate¿ (.)
21         once we use the::e (.)
22         the orthodontics apparatus
23         can be way bigger than the patient is (xxx)
24 ALE:    so you would comment that the specific case eh
25         applieds
26         applies to children
27         who have not completed their growth
28         right?
29 TOM:    [yeah]
30 OSC:    [(yeah)] (xxx)
31 ALE:    [okay so i'll jus-]
32 OSC:    [(xxx)]
33 ALE:    okay i comment on on the specifics of this case
34         which is the one presented to us
35         a:and u:uh i just say it's
36         it's how a:a
37         an adolescent would be treated
38         and that after a period of time
39         when they are sixtee:en seventeen
40         it's no longer possible to use the te-
41         this technique (.)
42 OSC:    ↑↓mmhmm
```

```
43 ALE:     okay?
44 TOM:     ↓↑mmhm
45 ALE:     so u:uh
46          here are-
```

This stretch of talk shows scaffolding conduct related to accomplishing the macro-task, or the presentation, rather than reaching intersubjectivity regarding recognition of a problem. Tomás does not carry out any actions to guide Alex towards understanding the problem on his own. He simply draws his attention to his proposed modification of Alex's script; in this case the change represents an addition of information to what Alex has presented (lines 7-9, 12 and 15). Alex confirms his understanding and acceptance of this suggestion using *okay*-tokens (lines 10-11 and 13).

In line 16, Oscar self-selects to expand on the propositional contents of Tomás' turn. He elaborates Tomás' explication by further highlighting the orthodontic practice to which Tomás referred, which was a description of what orthodontists do not do. In contrast to Tomás' formulation, Oscar recasts this concept as what orthodontists actually do (from line 18). In addition, he accounts for this practice by outlining its beneficial clinical outcomes (lines 19-23). In so doing, Oscar's turn also serves to account for the importance of including this information in Alex's presentation.

Both Tomás' and Oscar's contributions form a scaffold for Alex to accomplish an edition to his presentation part, by drawing attention to a specific element or need for his script. The scaffolding does not provide a re-formulated script, but leaves the modifying action to Alex to execute. Tomás recruits Alex's (and Oscar's) attention to a critical feature of Alex's performance, namely that his presentation is missing a piece of information. Oscar emphasizes particular aspects of the missing information, thus providing more focus regarding what exactly should be considered when including this information.

In lines 24-27, Alex requests confirmation for his understanding regarding the action that his co-participants have proposed. Upon receipting their confirmation, Alex re-creates his presentation content to incorporate the material Tomás and Oscar have brought to the foreground (33-41). Oscar and Tomás display their acceptance of Alex's modification (lines 42 and 44). It is important to note that Alex's newly authored formulation did not repeat any of the terms or phrasing that the other group members used in their turns. He achieved this action using his own resources. However, with the support of his peers, who enlisted his attention to a source of trouble that needed attending, he was able to carry out his presenting task appropriately.

Scaffolding activity may also occur for the scaffolding construction itself. To some extent, Oscar scaffolded Tomás's scaffold that emerged in Extract 10-3, by

indicating the critical features of the task he was carrying out: alluding to a problem to which he suggested needing edited. The following extract shows several scaffolding behaviors within scaffolding moves, as Laura attempts to draw Rita's attention to a problem that has emerged during Rita's rehearsing.

Extract 10-5

```
1 RIT:      we have to find a wire
2           that is exactly the same size as the slot.
3           so that we don't get undesired uh
4           movements of# °teeth#°
5           and we will have (that) [control
6 LAU:                              [(xxx)
7           e:ehm
8           (1.5)
9           this splai-
10          explanation
11 RIT:     yeah
12 LAU:     of thi:is
13          uh eh this slot size ((/sajð/))
14 RIT:     slot qué¿
                 what
15 LAU:     this slot size¿ ((/sajð/))
16 RIT:     size ((/sajz/)) you mean?
17 LAU:     size
18 RIT:     ↑↓ah
19          you said size ((/sajð/))
20 LAU:     size  size
21 RIT:     size
22          yeah
23 LAU:     when you:u
24          when you put a:a
25          bigger (1.0)
26 RIT:     wire?
           ((points to drawing on whiteboard))
27 LAU:     a bigger wire
28          eh.h# is mmm tch (.)
29          improve the mom-
30          the movement of the [(xxx
31 GAB:                         [it has mos-
32          more control (xxx)
33 RIT:     (we) have more more control
34          di- didn't i say that?
35          (1.5)
36 GAB:     no [(xxx)]
37 LAU:        [no]
38          i:i [said that mm']
39 RIT:         [well i]
40          i °<said that>°
            ((looks behind her towards the whiteboard))
41          what?
42 LAU:     that this picture (.)shows my:y
43 GAB:     your part
44 RIT:     your [part
45 LAU:          [my part
46 RIT:     okay so then i can just (.)
47          like mention it?
48          o:or#
49 LAU:     if you want?
50          >eh the<
```

```
51 RIT:     well i >i will do this<
52          an:nd i will say
53          as my m:yy
            ((using hands to indicate somebody next to her))
54          >as Loli said< (.)
55          ((slightly shrugs shoulders and holds hands outwards))
56          no¿
57 LAU:     .hh no but i didn't explain
58          i s- i only say that there are two [.h e:eh]
59 RIT:                                        [two sizes]
60 LAU:     two sizes
61 RIT:     .hhh [if you=]
62 LAU:          [a:and]
63 RIT:     =want here
64          you can say something.
65          if you want
66          o- or i have to say
67          because there are different sizes [(and xxx)
68 GAB:                                       [you only ]
69          mention it
70          and you explain it
71 RIT:     yeah
72 GAB:     there's nothing wrong about it
73 LAU:     you c-
74          you can only mention it
75          as as Loli said uh
76          there are two-
77          two:o [(xxx)]
78 RIT:           [okay so le-]
79          ((gets whiteboard eraser and turns to erase her drawing))
80 LAU:     of the
81          of the slot size
82 RIT:     let me practice that
            ((erases her drawing on the whiteboard))
83          ((laughs))
84 GAB:     okay
85 RIT:     .hhh
86          so ↑there's a question
87          that we have to take in count
88          >there's something we have to ge-<
89          take in count
90          is that uhm
91          the:e upper canine
92          can retro-incline
93          because ah as loli said
94          there are different sizes
95          of wires
```

Laura initiates her suggestion sequence in line 6, overlapping Rita's turn. Once she gains the floor, or Rita stops talking, the perturbation of her talk (lines 7-9 and 12-13) indicates possible difficulty that Laura may be experiencing in constructing her turn.

In line 14, Rita initiates a repair sequence by repeating a part of Laura's previous turn, the word uttered before one that she could not understand. Thereby, she has located the repairable, which is the miscomprehension of the word *size*, which

Laura is not pronouncing in a way that Rita can recognize. Laura repeats the phrase (line 15), but with the same pronunciation she has used in her prior turn.

Rita recognizes the word Laura is saying, and repeats it with a more standard pronunciation of *size*, and seeks confirmation from Laura that this was the word she had meant to use (line 16). Laura repeats the word, *size*, the way that Rita had pronounced it (line 17). The marked prosodic contour of the change-of-state token (*ah*) that Rita utters in response to Laura's adjusted pronunciation emphasizes that the 'inappropriate' articulation of this word was the culprit of Rita's misunderstanding. She then makes explicit Laura's erroneous action (line 19) by explicating what she had done, imitating her mispronunciation. Laura repeats the word *size* twice (line 20), after which Rita also repeats it again (line 21) and confirms Laura's pronunciation with a *yeah*-token (line 22).

Once this trouble has been repaired, and intersubjectivity regained, Laura resumes her trajectory of drawing Rita's attention to the problem she is trying to define (lines 23). Again, her stretched words and re-start (line 24) indicate possible trouble in expressing her idea. In line 26, Rita completes her turn with a candidate word, *wire*. Her rising intonation reveals her turn to be a try-marked turn (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). She points to a drawing on the whiteboard to assist comprehension of her turn.

Laura takes up the word that Rita has supplied, so she can continue her ongoing turn, or her laborious task to define the problem she would like to address. In lines 31-32, Gabriela attempts to complete Laura's turn. Rita orients to this idea by partially repeating Gabriela's version of Laura's explanation, and seeking confirmation that she had indeed included this concept in her script (lines 33-34). Rita's question indicates that she is now aware of the type of action that Laura is trying to achieve: that there is a problem she would like Rita to attend. She has interpreted Gabriela's turn completion as the source of the problem.

After a delay, Gabriela responds negatively to Rita's question, while Laura emphatically negates the general direction that this course of action has taken (line 37). Gabriela's turn completion has not identified the topic on which Laura wanted to focus. Laura again attempts to pursue the identification of the problem in which she is interested. At line 39, Rita overlaps Laura's turn as she tries to clarify what she had covered in her script regarding the topic that she believes Laura is trying to address. However, she displays confusion in lines 39-40 as she tries to formulate her explanation with a restart and trailing actions, and finally bluntly requests information from Laura regarding what she referring (*what?* in line 41). Upon two failed attempts to establish the problem that Laura is trying to explicate, Laura has garnered both of Rita and Gabriela's full concentration towards achieving this elusive task.

Laura refers to the image on Rita's slide (line 42), and starts her turn once again. The use of the personal pre-term, *my* (line 42), provides a cue for her co-participants about the type of word she would like to employ next, and the stretching of this word projects difficulty in continuing. Therefore, both Gabriela and Laura complete her turn (lines 43-44). Laura confirms that the appropriateness of their word choice by repeating it (*my part*).

Rita indicates her understanding, as well as acceptance, of the proposal she believes Laura is making (line 46). Since Laura has topicalized her part while referring to the image that is contained in Rita's slide, Rita's understands Laura to be suggesting that she is encroaching on Laura's territory, or presentation topic. This interpretation can be seen in Rita's proposal (lines 46-48) that she change her part in some way.

Laura responds with a tentative acceptance of Rita's suggestion (lines 49-50), but Rita takes the floor to further elaborate her proposed future action. Through this suggestion, Rita has displayed comprehension regarding the type of problem that Laura is targeting, that Rita is explaining a topic introduced in Laura's presentation part. However, in lines 57-58, Laura again attempts to further delineate the problem. She indicates that Rita does not have the whole picture by initiating her turn with contrastive-markers, *no but*. She emphasizes the particularly problematic aspect of the situation by using a negative form of the action (*didn't explain*) and the adverb, *only*, to describe what is lacking, and therefore must be addressed. In line 59, Rita completes Laura's turn with a candidate word, *sizes*, and Laura confirms this term as being appropriate by repeating Rita's contribution.

In line 61, Rita initiates another proposed way to solve the problem Laura has finally managed to make understood. Gabriela joins in finding a solution to the problem in line 68. At line 73, Laura incorporates content from both co-participants' suggestions to formulate her version of an edition to Rita's script. Rita agrees to the jointly constructed suggestion (line 78) and proposes that she practice this newly created script.

This stretch of interaction demonstrates scaffolding activity towards assisting a peer, who has relatively more limitations in her use of the language the group is using to carry out their shared task. Laura gradually achieves her co-participants' comprehension over a lengthy and tiered process and with their support. In their attempt to assist Laura in completing her task, Rita corrected her pronunciation of a term, Rita and Gabriela provided candidate turn completions—but did not take the floor at those times, and Rita requested clarification of Laura's idea. Most importantly, they gave her floor often enough to afford her the space to pursue,

with difficulty, her definition of the problem and also to participate in the co-construction of a solution to the problem.

Furthermore, Rita was ultimately scaffolded as well. At each moment that she displayed an understanding regarding the problem Laura was attempting to elucidate, she proposed a way to amend the problematic element. Once consensus regarding the modification was reached, she performed the presenting task, incorporating the material to which they have all contributed as can be seen in lines 93-95.

10.4 Collaborative Scaffolding

The scaffolding behaviors highlighted in the extracts presented so far in this chapter were observed in other sequences that emerged in these groups' suggestion projects. Another type of scaffolding activity was demonstrated within the long trajectory of problem-solving seen in Laia, Rosa and Cristina's meeting during which the members' co-constructed the formulation of a sentence to which Laia had drawn their attention. The following extract was seen in Chapter 8 (8-11c) and is reproduced here to showcase scaffolding activity that was not seen in the interaction of the other groups.

Extract 10-6

```
1  LAI:     [a:ah una cosa]
                 one thing
2  CRI:     [>i can say< either]
3           ((leans forward to look at Rosa; Rosa leans forward to gaze
            directly at each other.))
4           either=
5  ROS:     ((looks at Cristina))
6  CRI:     =to separate
7           o- or_
8           t- ge- get closer¿
9  ROS:     ((raises eyebrows; nods))
10 CRI:     in theory is correct?
11 ROS:     crec que sí
            I believe yes
12          ((turns to her computer to search for the structure))
13 CRI:     ((turns gaze towards Rosa's computer))
14 LAI:     ((continuing to look at the computer screen in front of
            her))
15          >buccal direction to proincline¿<
            ((reading PowerPoint slide))
16          >distal or mesial direction to separa:ate¿<
17          or¿ (.)
18          to get¿ (.)
19          ((typing))
            (3.0)
20          get closer.
21          (5.0)
            ((Rosa and Cristina looking at Rosa's computer; Laia
            looking at hers))
22 LAI:     jo ho posaria aquí a baix
```

```
            i would put it down here
23          i ho expli[ques]
            and you explain it
24  ROS:                [yeah.]
25          porque es en plan
            because it is like
            ((turns to look at Cristina;  Cristina looks at Rosa's
            computer))
26          o tal¿
            either this
            ((moves  hand to her left))
27          o tal.
            or that
            ((moves hand to her right))
28  CRI:    sí.
            yes
29          surt?
            does it come out ((show up))
            ((looking at ROS' computer))
30  ROS:    ((looks at her computer))
31  LAI:    ((turns head towards right shoulder and looks at PowerPoint
            slide))
32  ROS:    sí
            yes
33          tomar o té¿ o café.
            have tea or coffee
34          ((laughs))
35  CRI:    ((looks at central computer))
36          >distal or mesial to separate¿<
37          either to:o_
            ((moves head towards her right))
38  ROS:    ((looks at central computer))
39  CRI:    either to separate¿
            ((moves head to left))
40          or
            ((moves head to her right))
41          to get closer.
42          yes i think it's correct this
43          ((clears throat))
44  LAI:    i'll write it,
45          either to separate or get closer
            ((typing))
46  ROS:    ((looks at her computer))
47  CRI:    or if you don't want to put
48          i- i say it
            ((pushes hand forward palm towards herself))
49  ROS:    ((looks back at central computer))
50  LAI:    it's just a word
            ((looks up and towards Cristina))
51  CRI:    okay
```

In this extract, Laia is attempting to type the phrase that the three members have just finished formulating together. In line 2, Cristina initiates a proposal to further modify their newly co-authored phrase using the grammatical structure, *either-or*. She articulates a candidate formulation of the content, embedding the suggested structure within her sentence. She seeks confirmation of the accuracy of this construction from Rosa (line 10), and through the embodied action of turning her

gaze to Rosa's computer, requests that she search for this item to verify the correctness of her usage.

Once Rosa has located information related to this structure, she seeks confirmation from Cristina regarding the relevance of her findings, by translating the structure that Cristina would like to use in her script (lines 25-26). Cristina confirms that Rosa's understanding aligns with her own (line 28), and requests to know whether she has found the sought after information (line 29). Rosa confirms that Cristina's knowledge about the use of *either-or* in English is correct, and she reads aloud from the screen the translation of this structure, used in an example.

Cristina reformulates the sentence of her script incorporating the verified grammatical structure therein. In line 44, Laia takes up Cristina's suggestion by announcing that she will include Cristina's modification in the PowerPoint slide that she is in the process of typing.

The interaction in this extract included moments of collaborative scaffolding; in this case, however, Cristina elicited assistance from Rosa in order to achieve the task of editing her presentation piece. Though it is probable that Cristina would have carried out the word search herself had she had access to Rosa's computer, she depended on support from another in the achievement of her task. She drew attention to a problem she wanted to resolve, and she requested the type of assistance she required to execute this process. Upon obtaining the information from Rosa, she was able to carry out the editing, and ultimately the performance, of her presentation part. Furthermore, her self-directed scaffolding behavior led to Laia's use of the information that Rosa and Cristina had accessed in her written task. Thus, the scaffolding activity served to assist her performance as well.

10.5 Tools for scaffolding

Extract 10-6 also highlights the use of artifacts in the scaffolding process. Cristina and Rosa made use of a computer and Internet in their problem-solving. Moreover, as Cristina did not have physical access to Rosa's technical resources, she depended on Rosa to provide information that she needed in order to accomplish the task of re-creating her presentation script. Computer use, therefore, not only aids in the scaffolding process, but access to it may lead to the involvement of others in reaching their goals.

Another extract that shows the use of technical tools in scaffolding activity is the one analyzed in Chapter 9 (Extract 9-1), which contains a correction sequence among Alex, Tomás and Oscar. Whereas Cristina and Laia used Internet resources to locate grammatical information in their joint problem-solving activity, Alex

applied an application to provide evidence of a correct pronunciation of a term that Oscar had used in his rehearsal. This extract is reproduced below.

Extract 10-7

```
1 OSC:      (after) we talked about pain¿
2           e:ehm the next slide e:ehm
3           talks about the source of pain.
4           well usually e:ehm (1s)
5           eh the source of pain
6           may variate eh
7           depending on which area of the tooth
8           is receiving (.) more or less forces. (1s)
            ((4 lines removed))
11          therefore eh we can find
12          some ischemic ((/aiskimɪk/)) areas
             ((8 lines removed))
13          the next e:eh step
14          would be a pulpitis
15 COM:     [ischemic]
16 OSC:     [but pressure] has to be really high
17          (or relative)e:eh has e:eh pulpitis
18          after receiving orthodontic (pressure)
19 COM:     ischemic
20 ALE:     [tch .hhh]
21          ((bites his lips))
22 OSC:     [pain] eh is usually directly proportional
23          to the force applied
24          this is logical
25          because the more force you apply to a tooth
26          the more eh the (periodontal) ligament (suffers)
27          and therefore (xxx)
28          might
29          ((nods head))
30          be avoided
31 COM:     ischemic
32 ALE:     .hhh how did you say
33          the:e the:e (1s)
34          isquémia
            ischemia
35          we say in spanish
36          how did you pronounce it¿
37 OSC:     /aiskimɪk/
38 ALE:     [/aiskimɪk/]
39 TOM:     [°/aiskimɪk/°]
40 COM:     ischemic
41 TOM:     ((slightly creases eyes))
42 ALE:     cause in:n (.)
43          well i just looked it up
44 OSC:     ((laterally girates head upwards; creases eyes))
45 ALE:     cause I didn't either know how to:o (.)
46          pronounce it
47          a:and th[e howjsay u:uh]
48 TOM:             [°/aiski/- /aiski/-°]
49          /aiskim/-
50          i would say /aiskimik/ too
51 COM:     ischemic
52 ALE:     uhh# the howjsay website says (.)
53          ischemic ((/ɪskimɪk/))
54 OSC:     (ischemic)
55 ALE:     yeah i- i don't know
```

```
            ((widens eyes; tightly shakes his head 'no'))
56          i didn't know how to pronounce it either
57          so I just looked it up¿
58          and maybe
59          i don't know if you can hear it
60          one sec
61          ((tapping noise; whirring computer noise))
62          so (.)
63          this is what the website (.) says
64          ((clicking noise of the computer mouse))
65 COM:     ischemic
66 OSC:     ischemic (fine)
67 TOM:     ischemic
            ((backs away from screen))
68          >okay fine<
69          ((some lines seem to be cut out))
70 ALE:     just that
71          I think the the pace was fine
72          and oscar really explained things
73          that weren't in the:e (.)
74          in the slide
75          so it was great
76          (1.5)
77 OSC:     next topic is pain relief.
```

During the rehearsal of Oscar's part, he employs the term, *ischemic* (line 12), but he does not articulate it with a standard pronunciation. Over several turns, Alex constructs a fairly elaborate scaffold to assist Oscar in recognizing his mispronunciation of the term, and also accepting the one that Alex is suggesting is the correct form. To do this, Alex plays the word using the Howjsay.com website three times (lines 15, 19 and 31) before he finally vocally seeks to enlist Oscar's attention to the word (line 32). The voice in the computer is audible. The fact that he plays it three times, could be for various reasons. Perhaps he needed to hear it three times so that he could establish for himself what the correct pronunciation was.

Another possibility could be that he was providing evidence of the correct pronunciation to draw attention to this problem in order to pre-empt his having to actively call Oscar's attention to his mispronunciation. Alex claims (lines 45-46 and line 56) that he did not know how to pronounce the word. Nevertheless, he evidently had a suspicion about trouble in Oscar's pronunciation.

When the sound of the computer does not attract his co-participants' attention, Alex must recruit it by means of self-selected turn to initiate a correction sequence. He does not, however, directly inform Oscar of his finding. He instead asks Oscar how he had pronounced the word in question (lines 32-36). He does not say the term in question in English, but instead translates it. These practices, the question, the content of his turn, and the code-switching, work together to draw Oscar's attention to a type of trouble (pronunciation) and the source of trouble (ischemic),

but leaves the task of supplying the answer, or saying the word, for Oscar to complete.

Oscar responds to Alex's question with the word pronounced exactly the way he had done so in line 12. Both Alex and Tomás repeat Oscar's version of the pronunciation. In line 40, Alex plays the pronunciation that he accessed on the website, Howjsay.com. Though Tomás appears to be thinking about the topic, Oscar does not respond immediately. Alex gives an account for his decision to search for the pronunciation online: he claims insufficient knowledge. He positions himself as a learner or unknowing participant, with equal status to Oscar and Tomás, when he affirms that he *didn't either know how to pronounce it* (line 45). This turn not only displays a stance of solidarity, but also emphasizes the difficult nature of the task of pronouncing the word ischemic correctly. He repeats this conduct in lines 55-57, with more intensity observable in his embodied actions. Such interactional practices demonstrate face-saving behaviors regarding the occurrence of an error.

Upon receipting no clear sign of affiliation with his correction action, Alex sets up his computer equipment (lines 58-64) in order for Oscar and Tomás to be able to hear the Howjsay.com generated pronunciation more clearly. He plays it once, and both Oscar and Tomás repeat the word according to what they hear, and finally concede their approval of this pronunciation. Therefore, through the use of a computer artifact, Alex scaffolded not only Oscar's, but also Tomás' accomplishment of pronouncing a word according to standard pronunciation practices.

This interaction also revealed behavior related to stress management through face-saving behavior. Besides Alex's attempt to display solidarity and empathy in his referral to his own lack of knowledge prior to his search for the correct pronunciation (lines 45-46 and line 56), he also initiates a positive assessment sequence (lines 70-75). This sequence is related to other behaviors he observed during Oscar's rehearsal, during which the 'offending' pronunciation emerged. The practices that he highlights are related to Oscar's pace (line 71) and explanation (lines 72-74), both of which were carried out in a way that he had suggested doing in the interaction just previous to Extract 10-7 (see Extract 9-1 in Chapter 9).

The course of actions that make up the positive assessment is relevant to scaffolding activity in that it offers concrete feedback to Oscar's performance. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) listed 'feeding back' as one of the scaffolding, or assisting performances. This action consisted of giving the learner feedback regarding his or her performance in the completion of a task. Though Alex may have deployed a positive assessment to display a cooperative stance, or a mitigating action to downgrade the imposition that his correction may have

implied, he is simultaneously referring to Oscar's performance and explicitly evaluating it as more than appropriate.

No data is available to indicate how Oscar pronounced *ischemic* in his final classroom presentation. However, of special interest is his own scaffolding behavior in a similar sequence that unfolded during Tomás' rehearsal later during their meeting. This extract was shown in Chapter 5 (Extract 5-16). At this time Tomás is practicing his part, and Oscar recruits attention to a word that he states has been mispronounced.

Extract 10-8

```
1 TOM:      uhm and the most common thing you'll find
2           is the general-
5           uh generalized erythema ((/ɛrɪθemə/))
6           ((seven lines omitted))
7           the first thing to know is[that]
8 OSC:   →                            [(xxx)]
9 TOM:      (xxx) minimal
10 OSC:  →  have a little
11          i have a little comment to make
12          i looked up how to pronounce ehm:m
13          the word erythema ((ɛrɪðɪmə))
14 TOM:     mmhmm?
15 OSC:     it's pronounced
16          <erythema> ((ɛrɪðɪmə))
17 TOM:     erythema ((ɛrɪðɪmə))
18          okay
```

This stretch of talk emerged approximately three minutes after the correction sequence in Extract 10-7 between Alex and Oscar. Oscar makes a bid for the floor in line 8. Tomás stops his rehearsing, and Oscar prefaces his correction by announcing his future action, which is that he will make a comment. He then refers to an action he carried out (line 12), which was that he looked up a pronunciation of the word, *erythema*. This projects his upcoming correction, and Tomás invites him to continue with his utterance in line 14 (*mmhmm*?).

In spite of Oscar's having already indicated the pronunciation he has confirmed as correct by referring to the word in line 13, in line 15 he announces the presumably correct pronunciation of the term to which he has drawn Tomás' attention. Tomás immediately repeats the pronunciation that Oscar has indicated as being correct, and shows his acceptance with an *okay*-token (line 18).

Once again, this interaction is not a suggestion sequence; nevertheless, it serves to demonstrate a scaffolding practice that Alex had just used to support Oscar's achievement in overcoming pronunciation trouble. Though this sequence was not nearly as tedious as it's precursor, Oscar did preface his correction. He also topicalized the process he executed in order to determine the correct pronunciation—the same strategy to which Alex had referred and applied in his

correcting. Such interaction is similar to that seen in Extract 10-3, which demonstrated Laia's taking up of scaffolding practices, initially used by Cristina to assist Laia's performance (Extract 10-1), to later apply to her own problem solving activity. Scaffolding activity was scaffolded.

This extract (10-8) then exemplifies another case of assistance in the performance of scaffolding activity (like that seen in Extract 6-3). If we consider that Oscar's behavior was a result of Alex's previous interactional practices, we can say that Alex actually modeled scaffolding behavior, so that Oscar could achieve a task of scaffolding Tomás' mispronunciation. Oscar recognized a potential pronunciation problem, he utilized the same virtual artifact as did Alex, he delayed his correction (several lines after Tomás had said the word), and he constructed a pre-correction sequence. This extract may reveal scaffolding in the achievement of meta-learning behaviors.

10.6 Summary

This chapter has shown that the level of complexity in interaction that can arise in suggestion sequences, as well as in two correction sequences, may also provide fertile grounds for scaffolding behaviors among peers.

At no occasion in the data collected for this study did an interactant topicalize learning or explicitly refer to learning as an objective for the task at hand. Emerging interactional patterns that were molded by orientations towards participants' status, as well as by the nature of the types of projects emerging, also had the potential to act as scaffolds to assist peers in accomplishing a variety of tasks. This was seen in the turns designed to guide recipients in the achievement of certain actions desired by the interlocutors. These types of turn constructions revealed behavior like that associated with scaffolding practices, which could in turn provide opportunities for learning.

The students used some similar resources to initiate scaffolding sequences, such as known-answer questions, as seen in Extracts 10-1, 10-2 and 10-3. Scaffolding activity was not a uni-directional enterprise, but a collaborative and emerging one, as can be seen in Extracts 10-3, 10-4 and 10-6. Similarly, scaffolding sequences could be seen within larger scaffolding projects as the data in Extract 10-5 demonstrates.

This chapter also demonstrated episodes of possibly learning of scaffolding behaviors as seen in the interactions shown in Extracts 10-3 and 10-8 prior to which the interactants had engaged in similar activity (Extracts 10-1 and 10-7 respectively), but with different actors doing scaffolding and doing being scaffolded.

This chapter also highlights the multiple layers of interaction that can only be seen with clarity the type of micro-analysis that CA methodology can provide. The dynamics identified for one type of activity can be studied from and towards various perspectives.

Summary of Analysis Part 3

In Analysis 1 (Chapters 4, 5 and 6) data analyses of students' emerging interpretations of the tasks at hand indicated orientations towards:

> 1) Procedural processes of project organization and rehearsal activity, with an overlying level of this task structure being related to the group's PowerPoint presentation.
> 2) Criteria for a good oral presentation.
> 3) Collectiveness of the task—though each group member was responsible for a delineated domain of the presentation, responsibility for the creation of the presentation as a whole was shared. This was seen in students' talk-in-interaction outside of the rehearsing activity, such as during proposals and problem-solving sequences.
> 4) Owning, developing and presenting an individual part of the presentation.

In Chapters 7, 8 and 9 of Analysis Part 2, the main activities within the students' meetings were described. The analyses revealed:

> 1) The structures and behaviors of the sequences unfolding in each activity, as well as the relationships between them.
> 2) The structural organization of suggestion sequences, which despite their complex natures were co-constructed competently. Also shown were the participants' orientations towards certain rights and obligations associated with epistemic status, related to 'rehearser' or 'presentation part developer' status within suggestion sequences.
> 3) The way epistemic stances displayed over the unfolding interactions shaped and constrained these sequences, which in turn mobilized collaborative activity towards the accomplishment of the students' group work.

In the analysis of the data presented in Analysis Part 3, it is important to bear in mind actions performed and resources participants use in the interactional context (suggestion and correction sequences), as well as the tasks that peers are attempting to assist each other to achieve. As discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, the students' orientations to different levels of the meeting task shaped their suggestion and correction activity, and in turn, scaffolding activities. Orientations to the

rehearsing, as well as to the collaborative editing tasks, and also to the tasks related to reaching or maintaining intersubjectivity, could be seen within these contexts.

Furthermore, orientations towards epistemic primacy and the rights and obligations that were associated with this status, were seen to shape and constrain the interactions. The conduct emerging in suggestion and correction sequences was complex, and at the same time displayed cooperative attitudes. Such interactional contexts, and suggestion sequences in particular, can be described as primordial sites for the collaborative and contingent nature of interaction attributed to scaffolding activity.

Chapter 11

Discussion and conclusions

11.1 Introduction

This chapter of the thesis aims to set out the main contributions of the study, in relation to the research objectives set out in Chapter 1 and the theoretical and methodological contributions outlined in Chapters 2 and 3, as well as to lay the grounds for future research. Before turning to that discussion, a brief summary will be provided in this introductory section of the preceding chapters.

This thesis has contributed to the emerging research traditions of CA research for SLA and especially ICLHE educational contexts, as well as to lines of inquiry related to collaborative learning. The findings have elucidated certain types of interactions among students while carrying out meetings outside of class in preparation for a group project within a multilingual, university setting. The analyses presented have further shed light on the potential learning opportunities arising within these contexts.

More specifically the findings have contributed to the answering of the research questions outlined in Chapter 1 (Section 1.11). The research questions towards which Chapters 4 through 9 were directed targeted the first objective of this project, namely: *to describe the interaction among students engaged in carrying out a collaborative task within a multilingual, university setting outside of class*.

Questions related to Objective 1 focused on students' interpretations of learning tasks, and how they coordinated to achieve mutual understanding regarding the work at hand, especially in the absence of the teacher's presence. Findings related to these questions were reported in Analysis Part 1, which comprised Chapters 4, 5 and 6. The analyses of the data showed that students' interpretations and orientations towards objects that constituted the task goals aligned with the teacher's/researcher's own objectives for the meeting tasks.

Another research question related to Objective 1 related to the recurring activities that emerged over the course of the students' meetings (See Chapter 1, Section 1.11). Analysis Part 2, or Chapters 7, 8 and 9, presented studies of two distinct types of activity seen in the data, discussed the structures of the related sequences, and also the phenomena related to epistemic status that shaped and constrained the interactions. The findings from these analyses yielded a greater understanding by the teacher/researcher of the types of interactions that students accomplish in the co-construction their shared work as group members.

The findings in the chapters of Analysis Part 2 also demonstrated relevant influences on the unfolding activity, such as emerging epistemic orientations that mediate collaborative processes. Within the context of peer interaction, co-participants displayed stances towards epistemic statuses related to expertise in their assigned presentation subtopic.

After these initial analyses were carried out, the data was re-analyzed to answer questions related to Objective 2: *to explore whether the activities in which the students engage during their meetings afford learning opportunities towards the students' co-construction of language and content knowledge* (see Chapter 1, Section 1.11). The questions concretely refer to types of collaborative learning opportunities emerging within the peer interactions observed during the students' meetings, and take account of students' perspectives towards learning-related activity. Analysis Part 3 thus focused on scaffolding behaviors that were observed within the sequences presented in Chapters 4 through 9. The analyses presented in Chapter 10 corroborated the researcher's/teacher's previous perceptions that students' interactions in the context of the meeting assignment, without her presence, could lead to knowledge construction.

All data analyses in this study were grounded in conversation analytic theory and methodology in order to examine the interactants' behaviors at a fine level of granularity, identifying the organizational structures of their talk and the orientations that influenced them. Constructs related to theory in Epistemics informed analyses of the participants' orientations displayed throughout the meeting interactions. The findings have indicated that these approaches fit the research questions articulated in the beginning of this thesis, at the same time as the research questions were in part an outcome of the empirical process.

Chapter 11 provides an overview and discussion of the findings from the analyses of the data provided by the three student groups. The chapter is divided into the following sections. Section 11.2 gives a more in depth summary of the findings from the study. Sections 11.3 through 11.8 discuss more specific categories of findings. Section 11.3 presents a discussion of the ways that the physical environment and the artifacts used affected the interactions. In Section 11.4, results related to the students' interpretations of the task are re-visited. Findings regarding the main activities of the student interactions during the meetings are contextualized in Section 11.5. Section 11.6 discusses the findings of the analyses for the suggestion sequences. Section 11.7 provides a reflection on the participants' orientations towards status based on the data analyses, and Section 11.8 presents a discussion about the findings related to scaffolding behaviors observed in the data. Implications of the research and applications are outlined in Section 11.9, followed by suggestions for future directions presented in Section 11.10.

11.2 Summary of findings

The data analyses have shed light on collaborative processes that emerge during peer-to-peer group work outside of class. Evolving interpretations of the task at hand, as well as of the future oral presentation, were observable in the contents and interactional patterns of the video data recorded during the student meeting events.

Two main activities were discerned around which the interaction was organized and also to which participants oriented. The first was the rehearsing of the group members' oral presentation. Embedded within or surrounding the rehearsal activities, were sequences constitutive of the second main activity. This was non-rehearsing activity related to editing or somehow modifying various aspects of the previously developed presentation. These sequences, or rather projects, tended to be anchored in suggestion actions. The two activities were clearly bound by turns designed to initiate and close them.

Suggestion actions were shown to invite more natural interaction and episodes of collaborative work towards the accomplishment of the students' shared learning tasks related to the meeting and the oral presentation assignment. Participants' stances displayed toward each other's epistemic statuses were also shown to have a strong role in the turn-by-turn construction of these sequences.

Orientations towards the emerging statuses occupied by the members of the group shaped and constrained the interactions seen in the data. These were particularly prevalent in sequences during which suggestions were constructed. The delicate nature of proposing actions, like that seen in research about directives, and also the stances towards rights and obligations linked to presentation part ownership, gave rise to complex interactional patterns.

The complexity of the interaction that transpired over the course of suggestion sequences simultaneously afforded learning opportunities in the form of scaffolding behaviors. Scaffolds were collaboratively constructed and multi-directional. While the participants did not display orientations towards a 'learning' dimension of the task, these types of activities and interactional contexts assisted, or had the potential to assist, the participants in the achievement of various tasks that they might not have been able to complete individually.

11.3 Physical environment and artifacts

The openness of the instructions for the meeting task component of the group project led to the students' completing their tasks in a wide variety of settings, as could be seen in these three cases. It is not within the scope of this study to analyze

the differences in interactional patterns related to each of the settings. For example, the online interaction among Alex, Tomás and Oscar may have been shaped and constrained by contextual elements that were absent in the face-to-face interaction of the other two groups.

It is, however, interesting to consider the uses of artifacts that were deployed throughout the interactions and in the achievement of tasks. Interaction was seen around the use of a whiteboard (Rita, Laura and Gabriela), the recording devices, the computers for online resources, such as Howjsay.com, and also PowerPoint slides.

Part of the meeting-related task itself involved recording of the students' activity during this event and making it available to the teacher. The recording process was seen as influencing the interaction. The data collected presumably represented the type that the students deemed appropriate for the fulfilling the assignment. Furthermore, orientations were displayed towards what was considered legitimate activity to be included in the recording, such as when Rosa expressed interest in stopping the camera in Extract 4-2, analyzed in Chapter 4.

Furthermore, orientations towards what the visual field of the camera comprised could be seen when Rita urged Laura to position herself so that the recording could capture their writing on the whiteboard (Chapter 4, Extract 4-4). Similar orientations towards the recipiency of the camera were observable in Rosa, Laia and Cristina's talk directed at the teacher via the camera, such as greetings, comments, closings and embodied actions such as gaze and hand gestures, including waving goodbye (Chapter 4, Extract 4-1).

These activities indicate an awareness of the recording as representing an institutional presence, which perhaps could be understood as a motivation for much of the students' task-related behavior. For example, it is highly unlikely that these individuals would have otherwise spoken to each other in a language other than the ones in which they usually communicate (Catalan or Spanish in most of these cases) while planning their PowerPoint presentations. It is even plausible that they would not have organized a group meeting prior to their oral presentation at all.

Another artifact that had a strong bearing on task completion was related to the resources provided by the participants' computers. Online resources assisted the students towards achieving a variety of actions. They were utilized during problem-solving activity when the students displayed uncertainty towards contributions during word searches, or in relation to grammatical structures and pronunciations. Alex and Oscar also used Howjsay.com to support their claims of knowledge about pronunciation issues (Extracts 5-16 and 9-1).

The PowerPoint slides, however, played a prominent role in the accomplishment of the groups' shared goals. The students had developed their PowerPoint slides individually, outside of group interactions. During their meetings, the group members combined these separate parts to form a whole, collective version of their PowerPoint presentation. This presentation was to represent a group-created enterprise, which displayed their shared knowledge and organization thereof. Thus, the PowerPoint slides constituted a concrete transformation of individually 'owned' domain into a jointly owned one over the course of the meeting.

The PowerPoint slides were visible to the students as they rehearsed. They oriented to the content shown on the slides as providing a framework for their rehearsal activity. The task of rehearsing the PowerPoint presentation afforded a noticeable beginning, turn-taking slots related to the students' parts, and an ending. The presentation slides and script, therefore, were used as an omni-present guide for the accomplishment of this aspect of the task.

The PowerPoint slides also provided a space for the collective focus on the text and discourse of the emerging presentation. This object of attention afforded a backdrop for the subtopics, which each group member had developed individually and which were most likely being presented for the first time to others. The slides were analyzable sites for possible sources of trouble, which other members might desire to address. They also provided cues to where suggestions might be initiated (e.g. once the slide's contents had been covered). Once the suggestion or problem-solving activity had been closed, the slide oriented the students to the progressivity of the task. Rehearsers resumed their activity by moving on to the next slide, or incorporating newly co-constructed material into the slides they had just finished.

The PowerPoint tool was also a locus for co-creation of textual content, as was seen in the long project that emerged during Rosa, Cristina and Laia's meeting in the collective construction of a sentence (See Chapter 8, Extracts 8-11a, b and c). Behavior associated with access to computer keyboards during the completion of this group's co-construction of slide texts was observable as influencing interaction over various sequences.

11.4 Task interpretation

The means by which the students made their interpretations of the tasks visible was the topicalization of task instructions and of the business at hand, as well as by certain interactional patterns observed in meeting data. Explicit instructions were discussed in class regarding the oral presentation criteria. However, instructions for the actual meeting component of the project were left much more open. The students were simply told to record themselves rehearsing and preparing for their

presentation. They were informed that while this meeting activity formed part of the overall group project, the purpose of the task was strictly for formative assessment.

Each week, a different group presented a presentation for this assignment. Therefore, the students also experienced their peers' performances as audience members. Furthermore, these students had completed similar presentation assignments in previous ICLHE courses designed by the teacher/researcher. All of these contextual elements provide relevant background information in the shaping of the participants' interpretations of the task at hand.

Indeed, some references to the instructions presented by the teacher were made by the participants regarding the institutional dimension of their tasks (see Chapters 4, 5 and 6; Extracts 4-1, 5-1, 5-2 and 6-1). All of the groups topicalized aspects of the task requirements that they understood the teacher to have explicated during class. Furthermore, they used grammatical resources, such as *supposed to* or *have to* to display orientations to the responsibility to comply with these instructions. Rosa actually apologized to the teacher (Chapter 4, Extract 4-1), who was not present at the time, for not having recorded the group's earlier interaction when they had planned their presentation, indicating the type of instructions she thought was expected by the teacher.

Interactants also referred to the classroom presentation situation while considering the development of their presentation. Rita, Gabriela and Laura's group referred to a colleague's presentation when contextualizing and delimiting their presentation topic (Chapter 5, Extract 5-8), and they as well as Alex, Oscar and Tomás referred to the future audience when considering their oral presentation development (Extract 5-10 in Chapter 5). They explicitly considered the audience's recipient participation when outlining criteria for their PowerPoint presentation and performance.

Two groups (Cristina, Laia and Rosa, and Oscar, Tomás and Alex) referred to task activity they should carry out in their own homes, not during the meeting time, as a part of the presentation preparation (Chapter 4, 4-7 and Chapter 5, Extract 5-15). Such references further projected their interpretations regarding the type of activity that should (and should not) be carried out to achieve their tasks at hand during the meeting.

The features explicated above demonstrate explicit references to task instructions. Despite the topicalization of these requirements, the fluidity of the participants' understanding of the task was seen over the emerging execution of their task activity. Tasks were renegotiated and collaboratively managed, thereby revealing the evolving nature of task interpretations, which in turn, shaped their course of

actions. This was seen in Chapter 4, Extract 4-2, for example, when Rosa suggested that their meeting activity should comprise other actions besides the one Laia was carrying out. Her proposal followed a decision-making sequence during which the group had seemingly reached an agreement about how to proceed with their meeting task.

The students' interpretations of the tasks could be in seen their interactional behavior. Their interactions displayed orientations towards the type of activity they considered legitimate for the meeting itself and also for the oral presentation.

11.5 Main activities

The data indicated that the participants' interpreted the meeting event as a context in which they should rehearse and also further develop, or edit, aspects of their presentation. Their rehearsal participation framework comprised one rehearser speaking at a time while the other two members listened, or did not speak. While the rehearser maintained the floor, the others displayed orientations to the appropriateness of this behavior through continuers (e.g. *mmhmm*), affirmative tokens (e.g. *sí*) or embodied actions such as nodding.

The students displayed orientations towards the legitimacy of other activities that arose intermittently during the rehearsing task. Students sometimes initiated other-correction sequences related to pronunciation issues. These sequences were mostly very brief, and located close to the source of trouble. The brevity of these pronunciation sequences indicated orientations towards the absoluteness of one correct answer. There were not different, preferred options over which students might debate. It was readily resolved, and it did not represent an object that required much modification before they could return to the rehearsing task. Where uncertainty about the correct pronunciation was indicated, the groups usually used an external authority to resolve the issue.

These behaviors are similar to those reported in Devos' (2016) study, as well as research by Moore (2011) and others, which has demonstrated that peers in a CLIL context dedicate more attention to content issues than they do to language problems. Language trouble is resolved quickly to be able to achieve the progressivity of the task in which students are engaged.

Though these activities were categorized under two main types (rehearsing and non-rehearsing), these analyses have demonstrated a variety of interactions and types of communications that emerged within these contexts. This finding is consistent with Markee's (2000; 2004) position and findings in regards to taking a CA approach to studying talk-in-interaction in a learning situation. He has shown that CA is a valuable means to capture the wide variety of discourse that emerges

in classroom settings. The same can be said for the context of the present study, in which participants were peers working outside of class.

The analyses of Chapters 4, 5 and 6 also demonstrated the fluidity of the participants' interpretations of the tasks at hand. The interpretations of the tasks shaped and were shaped by the unfolding, collaboratively constructed interactional context. Similar findings have been reported by Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004), among others.

11.6 Suggestion sequences

Perhaps the greatest contribution of this research relates to suggestion sequences in collaborative learning contexts, which have occupied a large part of the analysis. Suggestions sequences also emerged during rehearsal activity in the data studied and constituted an actively collaborative dimension of the task as it unfolded. Within suggestion courses of actions, orientations to various aspects of the tasks were displayed. The sequences comprised complex interaction and sometimes led to problem-solving activity.

Participants' orientations regarding appropriateness of activities for the completion of their shared task were also made visible throughout the suggestion projects. The interaction and content of turns revealed that the students considered the meeting occasion to be a site for editing scripts and PowerPoint slides, problem-solving, and practicing newly created content. The sources of problems highlighted were related to the accuracy, articulation, distribution and organization of content. These elements were addressed as they were presented over the course of the unfolding rehearsal of the presentation. Non-rehearsers initiated turns to treat these perceived troubles at TRPs that were usually located at the end of a slide.

The students competently deployed many linguistic and non-linguistic resources to achieve intersubjectivity and carry out these task activities. Through the use of code-switching, grammatical, lexical, prosodic, embodied actions and also sequential resources, the participants aligned and achieved their shared goals. These findings are consistent with those reported in other similar settings (e.g. Moore, 2014; Jauni & Niemelä, 2014).

The structure and features of these bounded suggestion sequences were similar to those seen in other directive actions, such as requests (Curl & Drew, 2008; Heinemann, 2006), and in other proposal sequences (Houtkoop-Steensra, 1990; Stevanovic, 2012; 2013). As they were used to effect change in others' behaviors, they represented a certain degree of imposition. They were, therefore, dispreferred actions. The dispreferred nature of the suggestions was seen in the

use of mitigation markers, such as the use of modals and also polar interrogatives. They were sometimes followed by pre-suggestion sequences, and if not, they were accompanied with elaborations and accounts for the suggestions.

While orientations towards suggestions indicated they were considered delicates, they were sometimes contrasted with stronger forms of directives, as could be seen in Alex's reference to his action as being 'just' a suggestion (Chapter 8, Extract 8-1), rather than a more imposing action. Proposal sequences were also more cautiously constructed than, for example, announcements about the speakers' own actions in regards to changes made to their own presentation parts. For example, when Laia announced that she would paste an image in her slide she used the affirmative structure *I will* (Chapter 6, Extract 6-5), rather than a weaker, mitigating form with model structures, and no vocal response followed this action. Though it is not within the scope of this thesis, a study comparing suggestion sequences with other courses of actions towards effecting changes in the presentation and task activity could further differentiate the behavior seen in these interactions.

The suggestions structures were also unlike most of the correction sequences that tended to arise during rehearsal activity. This may be related to attitudes regarding the number of appropriate options. The students seemed to orient towards there being one way to pronounce a word correctly, whereas alternative options were invoked during suggestion sequences. Drawing attention to various and possibly preferred ways to present the presentation content led to negotiation and sometimes co-construction of the material, with different candidate versions being proposed and defended. Mandelbaum (1996) also reported this aspect of suggestions as a component of the interactional context.

Suggestion sequences demonstrated orientations towards the collectiveness of the task. They revealed stances towards the co-presenter identities. Through carefully structured sequences, interactants displayed their stances towards their entitlement to have a say in the way that their group presentation was to be carried out. However, other coinciding orientations towards asymmetrical statuses were also in play. Asymmetry was observable in terms of the rights and obligations associated with rehearser status.

11.7 Status

Rehearsers enjoyed a multi-faceted status. In the context of the task itself, as described in 11.5, rehearsers were oriented to as the designated speaker. They held the floor. This status was also related to a domain that the group had jointly assigned the rehearser in a previous meeting. So the relationship that the rehearser developed with a subtopic of the overall group topic was collectively

recognized as the rehearser's ownership. This 'part' was referred to in possessive terms (for example, with the use of possessive proterms like *your* or *my* part as stated in Extract 8-7 in Chapter 8).

Furthermore, each rehearser had been responsible for developing the content of their parts. This had important implications for their status. They had more experience with the information of their part through the extra work they applied to that defined area. In this way, they assumed expertise status, which translated into responsibility for knowing more about their domains than others, as indicated by certain orientations displayed in the data (See Chapter 5, Extract 5-3 for an example of this type of stance).

This type of status, then, corresponded to their epistemic primacy over the others. This status meant that they were responsible for possessing a more in-depth understanding of their topic. It also conferred them a certain level of entitlement in decision-making regarding the organization and articulation of the content related to their parts, despite the certain degree of epistemic access to the overall topic that all the group members had. . Similar phenomena have been reported in other meeting contexts (e.g. Asmuß & Oshima, 2012), in which orientations toward identities related to hierarchy in work settings were also displayed. Similar patterns were seen in work by Stevanovich (2012; 2013), who also studied stances displayed towards the entitlement related to a status of authority in proposal sequences. She categorized this status as *deontics*, which could be based on epistemic status.

Orientations towards epistemic status were visible in the openings of the suggestion sequences by the suggester, and in the management and closing of the sequences mainly performed by the rehearser. These stances were present in the mobilization of collaborative actions in the process of co-constructing the students' presentation. Furthermore, they were seen in the maintenance of the overall task progressivity.

The epistemic stances displayed by the suggester in the opening of suggestion sequences projected orientations towards the expertise of the suggestee or rehearser. This course of actions, in turn, primed the context in order to make a suggestion action more acceptable by the suggestee.

Orientations towards the suggestee's epistemic primacy were seen to permeate the resulting democratized interactional space. They managed the sequence in the negotiation of the future action, editing practice or problem solving activity. These sequences often involved participation by all the students present. Though consensus was preferred and sought, the suggestee usually had the final say

regarding the joint decisions about the object of interest and closed the sequence to resume the role of rehearsing.

To the knowledge of the researcher, no findings regarding participants' stances towards epistemic status displayed in suggestions sequences emerging within a similar learning settings have been reported previous to the present study.

11.8 Scaffolding behaviors

The contextual features of the interactions seen in the data afforded potential learning opportunities for the students in the form of scaffolding behaviors. As seen in the analyses of suggestion sequences (Chapters 8 and 9), co-participants initiating proposals attempted to assist recipients to achieve certain actions in projects towards ultimately changing items in their presentation parts. Those same actions could be considered from the perspective of scaffolding constructs. While the students' orientations towards the learning dimension of the task was not explicitly articulated, their conduct mimicked practices that are commonly observed among teachers or tutors in learning settings.

Participants enlisted the attention of the rehearsers to perceived sources of trouble, but in a way so as to allow the rehearser to 'discover' the problem without the suggester having to make a suggestion or solution explicit. Sometimes the suggestees cooperated and actually executed the tasks with the assistance of the suggesters, as seen in Chapter 8, Extract 8-5. In this interaction Cristina provided a scaffold for Laia, who eventually took up Cristina's suggestion.

At other times the recipients simply acknowledged the problem and proposed a solution, as is seen in Tomás' response to Alex's suggestion actions in Chapter 10, Extract 10-2. Tomás is not seen to take up Alex's obscure proposal to clarify some of the content in Tomás' presentation. He does, however, comply with the scaffolding actions that Alex sets for him towards recognizing the element that Alex perceives as a problem. Namely, he answers Alex's known-answer question.

Scaffolding in this context, defined as behaviors that assist others to carry out tasks that learners may not have been able to do without others, was not uni-directional, but multi-directional. It was collaboratively constructed among multiple participants. It often involved the participation all of the group members, not only the suggester and suggestee. Such participation frameworks and interactional practices can be seen to meld into a fertile context for potential learning opportunities.

Of special interest were the participants' orientations towards the learning dimensions of the meeting and overall group project. As mentioned in Chapter 3,

one aspect of the oral presentation assignment that was explicitly discussed during class was related to the teaching role of the presenters. The oral presentation, which other students were to attend and ask questions about, represented a means to further teach or reinforce content from their orthodontics class.

During the course of the students' meetings, the participants oriented towards the teaching aspect of the assignment in their positioning as future presenters, or experts, of their oral presentation topics. They did not, however, orient explicitly towards teaching or learning activity as constituting a goal for tasks related to 'doing a meeting'. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, the students' interpretations of the meeting tasks concerned activity other than for teaching or learning. Yet, their interpretations of the tasks led to interaction in which scaffolding, or learning opportunities, arose. This context then arguably led to possibilities for learning, whether intentional or not.

These findings are in line with those highlighting agency in task interpretation and management (Markee, 2000; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Seedhouse, 2005; Jakonen & Morton, 2013) that create a potential rich context for learning. The findings are somewhat different in that the learning opportunities that emerge were seemingly not oriented to by the peers as being possible learnables. The learning dimension was a by-product in the interactants' attempts to accomplish other actions.

No other CA study, to the knowledge of the researcher, has been published about scaffolding behaviors emerging within suggestion sequences in group work among student peers.

11.9 Didactic implications

This section is dedicated to exploring applications of findings from this thesis. In particular, this section will address the research question related to Objective 2 (Chapter 1, Section 1.11) and articulated in the following way:

> *In what ways can the researcher, as a teaching practitioner, further enrich this learning context and encourage meaningful learning activity?*

The findings of these analyses support the development of the type of learning tasks described in this educational environment. They have been shown to be constitutive of a potentially rich and multi-layered context for learning in an ICLHE setting.

Moreover, the analyses have demonstrated that students in this type of situation can competently interact to collaboratively achieve a demanding academic task,

without the physical presence of a teacher. Though possibility had been intuitively understood prior to the study based on the performances of students in previous years, this data-driven study was able to confirm these notions. The analyses of the interaction at a micro-level demonstrated that the meeting task component of the group project affords various types of interactions and opportunities for which students can use different types of resources in the process of task accomplishment.

As a teaching resource, the data open a window into students' interaction with minimal teacher intervention. The recording action and devices represent a type of institutional presence, which may assist student participation in the pursuit of their task. It may do so by lending a sense of legitimacy to this type of learning context. For example, it may encourage students to interact in their additional language while preparing for an oral presentation.

The data can also serve as a means for formative assessment. For example, in spite of the rigorous problem-solving activity that Cristina, Laia and Rosa carried out to search for the word, *procline*, they did not find the correct form (See Chapter 8, Extract 8-11a, b and c). Their data might be useful information towards developing teaching and learning material for this group or for the whole class.

The data also might provide the means for other types of learning opportunities; for example, tasks involving student reflective processes or self-assessments of their interactions when viewing the recordings. The students' oral presentations are also recorded, and they are required to carry out self-assessment activities. Similar work could be applied in these data. In particular, a longitudinal perspective to the participants' development could be taken using the data from the pre-presentation meetings and the final classroom presentation.

Only four groups provided data showing fairly long interactions that included sequences of rehearsing and co-construction of the presentation. Data from three of these groups were included in the data analyses for this thesis. Video data from all the other groups mainly showed students carrying out exploratory talk prior to the development of their presentation slides or mostly rehearsal activity. Not including this type of interaction in the recordings did not mean that the students did not engage in the types of activity observed in the data analyzed for this study. However, it is unlikely they spoke in their additional language as much as what was seen in these groups.

It may be beneficial for students and the teacher/researcher to craft the task in a way that could encourage students to produce videos of their meeting similar to the recordings provided by these three groups. Without designing overly restrictive instructions, perhaps the students could be guided towards including

this type of conduct in their recordings. Reviewing some of the past data with current students could broaden their perceptions regarding the types of activity that can occur in such meetings. Indeed, some later students have inquired about this possibility when discussing the assignment during class. Such an activity would render this task even more contingent on students' interpretations, and in turn make it a more student-centered enterprise. At the same time, a bridge between research and teaching/learning practices would be built.

11.10 Future directions

This study has shown ways in which students can interact competently in complex activity in an additional language. Two of the students (Laura and Rosa) had relatively lower language levels in comparison to their peers; nevertheless, their interactional resourcefulness meant that potential linguistic limitations did not represent insurmountable barriers in the achievement of the academic task. Future research in this line of investigation could include students with lower levels of their additional language, as defined by traditional assessments of linguistic competence. Findings from analyses of these data would certainly contribute to the emerging understanding and design of the researcher's ICLHE setting, where there is much diversity in students' backgrounds as regards the English language.

Furthermore, it would be of interest to collect and analyze data from students in this learning situation with differing first languages. All the participants in these data were from Catalonia. Less homogeneity among group members in such a project may require other types of interactional resources in the co-construction of academic tasks. Such a context may give rise to plurilingual practices, as have been seen in research by Borràs, Moore and Nussbaum (2015), for example, other than the ones observed in the present study.

Both of the research directions described in this section have the potential to contribute to the researcher's present educational setting and practice, as well as to the broader areas of collaborative learning, ICHLE and related fields of inquiry.

Afterword

This doctoral project represents an undertaking to which I can honestly say that I have aspired for most of my life. I had strong childhood models for pursuing a place in academia through my parents, who besides holding higher degrees themselves, encouraged my sister and me towards this objective.

In the early years of my career as a teacher, my goals for such an enterprise were more professionally driven. My plans for my future employment and research in education were tied to academia in the higher education setting. Therefore, aiming for a PhD was a natural part of this process.

This part of the plan, however, did not come to fruition until many years after obtaining my Master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in 1987. When the opportunity finally arrived for my being able to start this journey towards fulfilling this longtime educational dream, however, I was another person. My orientations towards this project were vastly different from those that had motivated my educational endeavors in earlier years.

At that time that I began my PhD, my aspirations towards studying for a doctoral degree were related more to personal growth. I can say that this project has exceeded my expectations in this area.

I have learned a myriad of very important life lessons. I have learned how to find a calm mental and emotional space when stress seemed ready to overcome me. I have come to re-experience a certain joy during long periods of learning processes. I learned to learn. One of my goals was met in deepening my own understanding of the role of theory, and also how to interact with theoretical constructs with more confidence.

I have learned that learning, and also formulating my own reflections about new knowledge, takes time—sometimes years, which actually surprised me! I especially learned that this type of activity is constructed through various levels of support from a large community. It is not something developed by one individual. During this process, I was surprised to feel my own identity as a researcher developing. I remember the day that I actually felt, for the first time, a responsibility to the CA and Educational research community.

Some of the outcomes of this project had effects on the community around me as well. Other teachers in the team I work with also set up academic goals of their own. It strengthened collaborative relationships between our department and other Health Sciences departments. But the effect that proved to be a most unexpected benefit was the relationship that was developed between me as a teacher/researcher and my students/participants.

This project motivated many of the students to participate more in the task at hand. They seemed curious in that they asked me often about the research. They also asked to help with the recording process in class—I also collected data of the students' final presentations, although these were not included in this study. A

main theme for our courses is related to research methodology. Though the focus is on quantitative research, the students expressed interest in participating in a real and authentic research study. I will be sure to work with this element of my research in future classes.

Finally, one of the goals of this project was to learn how to carry out a research project of this size. I had taught and advised graduate students about such projects, but this was based mostly on theoretical notions and textbook entries. I now feel like I am in a place where I can speak with more expertise regarding this process.

I am also very thankful for the opportunities that the Dentistry Department has provided. They give our department a large amount of autonomy when it comes to designing our courses for their program. I have discussed further plans to collaborate with this department in carrying out research with some of their professors. They have also expressed interest in such collaboration, especially since there is great pressure to publish at this time. I am particularly interested in working with this department to study the development of professional identity among students during clinical training.

However, such a plan may be more complicated than initially anticipated. We have in fact begun a longitudinal survey-based study regarding the students' perspectives of Evidence-based Dentistry. While such a line of inquiry is warranted within the frame of the Dental Faculty related to Educational research objectives, it diverges strongly from the type of interactionist and interpretive type of research that I would like to carry out.

The Medical Faculty has dedicated much time and effort into exploring innovative approaches in their program. They also explicitly foment physician empathy as part of the professional development of their students. I believe these aspects of the Medical faculty's objectives for their curriculum might afford more research opportunities for the type of study in which I would like to participate as I continue to grow as a researcher.

By including this afterword, I hope to have conveyed a more personal message, or painted a more subjective picture, of this research as a beginning. While I am greatly relieved to have reached this final stage of the project, it has definitely changed my world and made possible the beginning of many other projects to come.

Transcription Key

The transcription practices of this study follow the Jeffersonian (2004) system of transcription notation.

Symbols	Descriptions
[ ]	Overlapping talk: the left bracket indicates where overlapping begins and the right bracket, where it ends
=	Latched talk: there is no interval between the end of the previous turn and the beginning of the next one
(.7)	Interval within and between utterances: A number in parentheses represents the amount of time (within tenths of a second) that a moment of silence within talk-in-interaction lasts
(.)	Interval within and between utterances: A period between parentheses represents a micropause lasting under 0.1 seconds.
hhh	Hearable exhaling; sometimes laughter
.hhh	A period preceding the 'hhh' symbol indicates hearable inhalation
<u>okay</u>	An underlined word or phrase indicates emphasis or marked stress
SO	Capital letters indicate increased volume
º okay º	Degree signs: decreased volume of the utterance they mark
of#	Creaky voice
> <	Inward pointing indents surrounding an utterance indicate a faster pace or tempo compared to other surrounding talk
<erythema>	Outward pointing indents surrounding an utterance indicate a slower pace or tempo compared to other surrounding talk
so::o	Colons indicate stretching of the sound or syllable. Each colon represents duration of one beat.
bu-	One hypen represents a cut-off of the word
?	A question mark indicates a rising final intonation
.	A period indicates a falling final intonation
,	A comma indicates a low-rising final intonation, which suggests a contuation of the turn
¿	An inverted question mark represents a mid-rising final intonation
↓	A downward pointing arrow indicates a sharp decrease in pitch
↑	An upward pointing arrow indicates a sharp increase in pitch
((nods))	Double parentheses contain researcher's comments, which may include descriptions of embodied actions.
(cool)	Parentheses indicate that uncertain transcription
(xxx)	X's within parentheses indicate that the utterance was not understood at all
→	An arrow in the margin pointing towards an utterance is used to highlight a phenomenon in the extract
val	Words in Italics are in Catalan
vale	Words in boldface are in Spanish
val okay	Translations of the Spanish or Catalan utterances are located under the utterances.
/aiskimɪk/	Phonetic transcriptions are encased between slashes.

Bibliography

Academic Cooperation Association. (2008). *Annual report 2007*. Brussels. Retrieved from: http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/annual_reports/AR2007_final.pdf

Albert, J.-L. & Py, B. (1985). Interlangue et conversation exolingue. *Cahiers du Departement des Langues et des Sciences du Langage*, 1. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.

Aline, D. & Hosoda, Y. (2009). Orientations to language code and actions in group work. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics / Revue Canadienne de Linguistique Appliquee,* 12 (1): 59-83.

Altbach P. G. & Knight J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4): 290-305.

Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen & I. Leudar (Eds.). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26-42). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Anton, M. & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom." *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 54: 314–42.

Asmuß B. & Oshima S. (2012). Negotiation of entitlement in proposal sequences. *Discourse Studies*, 14 (1): 67-86.

Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In: M. Heller (Ed.). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 187 – 213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barnett, R. (2004). The purposes of higher education and the changing face of academia. *London Review of Education,* 2 (1): 61-73.

Beacco, J.C. (2005). *Languages and Language Repertoires: Plurilingualism as a way of Life in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Beach, W. (1995). Conversation analysis: "Okay" as a clue for understanding consequentiality. In: S. Signman (Ed.). *The consequentiality of communication* (pp. 121 – 162). London: Routledge.

Bentley, Y. & Warwick, S. (2013). An investigation into students' perceptions of group assignments. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 3 (3): 11-19.

Bolden, G. (2009). Beyond answering: Repeat-prefaced responses in conversation. *Communication Monographs*, 76 (2): 121-143.

Borràs, E., Moore, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2015). Comment les étudiants montrent leurs connaissances dans des interactions internationales. In: X. Gradoux, J. Jacquin, & G. Merminod (Eds.). *Agir dans la diversité* (pp. 171 – 190). Leuven: de Boeck.

Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. Candlin & D. Murphy (Eds.). *Language learning tasks*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brouwer, C. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS Interaction: opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal,* 87: 534-5,45.

Brouwer, C. E. & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 1 (1): 29-47.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burdett, J. (2003). Making groups work. University students' perceptions. *International Education Journal,* 4 (3): 177-191.

Burdett, J. (2007). Degrees of separation: Balancing intervention and independence in group work assignments. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 34 (1): 55-71.

Cazden, C. (1979). Peekaboo as an instructional model: Discourse development at school and at home. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 17: 1-29.

Clark, H. H & Haviland, S. E. (1977). Comprehension and the given-new contract. In: R. O. Freedle Ed.). *Discourse production and comprehension* (pp. 1-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Clark, H. & Tree, J. E. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84: 73-111.

Clayman, S. (2002). Sequence and solidarity. *Group Cohesion, Trust and Solidarity,* 19: 229-253.

Coleman, J. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39 (1), 1-14.

Commission of the European Communities. (2003). *Promoting language learning and diversity: Action plan for 2004-06 (COM (2003) 449 final).* Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf

Commission of the European Communities. (2005). *A new framework strategy for multilingualism* (COM (2005) 596 final). Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/archive/doc/com596_en.pdf

Costa, F. & D'Angelo, L., 2011. "CLIL: A suit for all seasons?" *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 4(1):1-13.

Coste, D., Moore, D. & Zarate, G. (1997). *Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle. Langues vivantes. Vers un Cadre Européen Commun de référence pour l'enseignement et l'apprentissage des langues vivantes : études préparatoires.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2007). Assessing and accounting. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.). *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction* (pp. 81-119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. & Etelämäki, M. (2015). Nominated actions and their targeted agents in Finnish conversational directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78, 7-24

Coyle D., Hood P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crowther, P., Nilsson, B., Joris, M., Otten, M., Teekens, H., Wächter, B. (2000). *Internationalisation at home: A position paper*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Crystal, D. (2003): *English as a global language, 2nd edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Curl, T. & Drew P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 41 (2): 1-25.

Dafouz, E. & Núñez, B. (2009). CLIL in higher education: Devising a new learning landscape. In: E. Dafouz & M. Guerrini (Eds.). *CLIL across educational levels* (pp. 101-112). Madrid: Richmond Publishing.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T. & Smit U. (2010). Charting policies, premises and research on content and language integrated learning. In " In C. Dalton-Puffer, T ,Nikula & U. Smit U. (Eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 1-20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davies, W. M. (2009). Groupwork as a form of assessment: common problems and recommended solutions. *Higher Education,* 58 (4): 563-584.

De Pietro J. F., Matthey M. & Py B. (1989). Acquisition et contrat didactique: Les séquences potentiellement acquisitionnelles de la conversation exolingue. In: D. Weil D. & H. Fugier (Eds.). *Actes du troisième colloque régional de linguistique* (pp. 99 – 124). Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines et Université Louis Pasteur.

Devece, C., Peris-Ortiz, M., Merigó, J. M. & Fuster, V. (2015). Linking the development of teamwork and communication skills in higher educaiton. In: M. Peris-Ortiz & J. M. Merigó Lindahl (Eds.). *Sustainable learning in higher education* (pp. 63-73). Heidelberg: Springer.

Devos, N. (2016). *Peer interactions in new content and language integrated settings.* Heidelberg: Springer.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf (Ed.). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). London: Ablex Publishing.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In: P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duran, D. (2010). Cooperative interactions in peer tutoring: Patterns and sequences in paired writing. *Middle Grades Research Journal,* 5(1): 47-60.

Enfield, N. (2011). Sources of asymmetry in human interaction: Enchrony, status, knowledge and agency. In: T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.). *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 285–312). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society* 5: 26-66.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1982). Ask and it shall be given you: Children´s requests. In: H. Byrnes (Ed.). *Georgetown Roundtable on Languages and Linguisitics, 35* (pp. 235 – 245). Washingtown DC: Georgetown University.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., J. Guo & M. Lampert (1990). Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14, 195-219.

Escobar Urmeneta, C. (2004). Content and integrated learning. Do they learn content? Do they learn language. *Proceedings from the XXI International Conference AESLA*. 27-38.

European Commission (2010) *The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning*. Brussels. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/sites/eac-eqf/files/leaflet_en.pdf

Eurydice (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.* Brussels. Retrieved from: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/ressources/Eurydice/pdf/0_integral/07IEN.pdf

Fabregas Janeiro, M. & Gaeta González, M. (2015). Developing students' autonomy and self-regulation through a co-teaching research methods experience. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research,* 8 (1): 25-32.

Fernandez, M., Wegerif, R., Mercer, N. & Rojas-Drummond, S. (2001). Re-conceptualizing 'scaffolding' and the zone of proximal development in the context of symmetrical collaborative learning. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 36 (2): 40-54.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in second language acquisition research, *The Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3): 285-300.

Fry, H., Ketteridge, S. & Marshall, S. (2009). Understanding student learning. In: H. Fry, S. Ketteridge & S. Marshall (Eds.). A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: Enhancing academic practice (pp. 8-27). New York: Routledge.

Gajo, L. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 10 (5): 563–581.

Gajo, L. & Berthoud, A.C. (2008): *Construction intégrée des savoirs linguistiques et disciplinaire dans l'enseignement bilingue au secondaire et au tertiaire. Diversité des langues et compétences linguistiques en Suisse. Rapport final.* Geneva: Université de Genève.

Gajo, L., A. Grobet, C. Serra, G. Steffen, G. Müller & A.-C. Berthoud. (2013). Plurilingualisms and knowledge construction in higher education. In A.-C. Berthoud, F. Grin & G. Lüdi (Eds). *Exploring the dynamics of multilingualism. The DYLAN Research Project* (pp. 287–308). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gardner, R. (2008). Conversation analysis and orientation to learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5 (3): 229–244.

Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.). *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gardner, R. & Wagner, J. (2004) (Eds.). *Second language conversations: Studies of communication in everyday settings*. London: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical action. In: J. C. McKinney & A. Tiryakian (Eds.). *Theoretical sociology: perspectives and developments* (pp. 338-66). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsyvania Press

Goodwin C. & Goodwin, M. (2004). *Participation*. In: A. Duranti (Ed.). *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 222-244). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goodwin, C. (2007). Interactive footing. In: E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.). *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction* (pp. 16 – 46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, M. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk*, 26 (4/5): 515–543.

Guerrero, M. C. M. & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*, 51-68.

Hall, J. K, Hellermann, J. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011) (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hall, J. K. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). Introduction: Interactional competence and development.. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206-243) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

He, A. (2004) CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 568–582.

Heinemann, T. (2006). 'Will you or can't you?': Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 38: 1081-1104.

Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 7 (4): 473-492.

Hellerman, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In: J. K Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp.147-172). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hepburn, A. & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.). *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299 – 345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society,* 27: 291–334.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In: R. Sanders & K. Fitch (Eds.). *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103 – 146). Mawah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. In: A. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.). *"Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 42–68). New York: Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012a). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45 (1): 30–52.

Heritage, J. (2012b). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45 (1): 1-29.

Heritage, J (2013a). Turn-initial position and some of its occupants. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57: 331–337.

Heritage, J. (2013b). Epistemics in conversation. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.). *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370-394). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Heritage, J. (2013b). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, 15 (5): 551–578.

Heritage, J. (2015). Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 88: 88–104.

Heritage J. & Sefi S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. In: P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Talk at work* (pp. 359 - 417). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, *23*(1): 1–29.

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.

Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In: J. De Ruiter (Ed.). *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 179-192). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. & Watson, D. R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In: G. Psathas (Ed.). *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 123 – 162). New York, London: Irvington.

Holt, E. 2010. "The last laugh: Shared laughter and topic termination", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6): 1513-1525.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, J., 1990 "Normative and analytical perspectives on interviewing techniques." In *Unity in Diversity* edited by Pinkster H. & Genee I. Dordrecht,Foris Publications: 133-151

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1992). *A framework for testing cross-cultural pragmatics*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media talk. Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Huth, T. (2010). Can talk be inconsequential? Social and interactional aspect of elicited second-language interaction. *The Modern Language Journal. 94* (4): 537-553.

Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In: H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Talk-in- interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351-385). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jackson, N. (2014). Towards a lifewide curriculum. *Lifewide Magazine*, 9: 18-22. Retrieved from: www.lifewidemagazine.co.uk/uploads/1/0/8/4/10842717/lifewide_magazine_9.pdf

Jacoby, S. & Gonzales, P. (2002). Saying what wasn't said: Negative observation as a linguistic resource for the interaction achievement of performance feedback. In: C.A. Ford, B. Fox & A. A. Thomson (Eds.). *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 123 – 164). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jakonen, T. & Morton, T. (2013). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*. Doi: 10.1093/applin/amt031.

Jareño, F., Jiménez, J. J., Lagos, M. G. (2014). Cooperative learning in higher education: Differences in perceptions of contribution to the group. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal,* 11 (2): 66-80.

Jauni, H., & Niemelä, N. (2014, March). Language learning in task management and task accomplishment. Paper presented at the *Higher Education Perspectives on CLIL Conference*, Vic, Catalonia, Spain.

Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.). *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 79-96). New York: Irvington.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: G. H. Lerner (Ed.). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory into Practice,* 38 (2): 67-73.

Joseph, A., & Payne, M. (2003). Group dynamics and collaborative group performance. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin,* 35 (1): 368-371.

Judd, T., Kennedy, G., & Cropper, S. (2010). Using wikis for collaborative learning: Assessing collaboration through contribution. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26 (3): 341-354.

Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientation in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal,* 88 (4): 551-567.

Koole, T. (2012). The epistemics of student problems: Explaining mathematics to a multilingual class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44: 1902-1966.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 5: 277–309.

Krafft, U. & Dausendschön-Gay, U. (1994). Analyse conversationnelle et recherché sur l'acquisition. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée,* 59: 127-158.

Kramsch, C. (1985). Classroom interactions and discourse options. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*: 169-183.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal,* 70 (4): 366-372.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning,* 54 (1):79-117.

Lee, Y-A. (2006). Respecifying display questions: Interactional resources for language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*: 691–713.

Lee, Y-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39: 1204-1233.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59 (4): 303-321.

Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In C. Ford, B. Fox & S. Thompson (Eds.). *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 225-256). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. In: G. Lerner (Ed.). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 225–256). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Levinson, S. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis (*pp. 103–130)*.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, E. (2010). Making suggestions: A contrastive study of young Hong Kong and Australian students. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42: 598–616.

Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: a study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In: A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.). *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-Interaction* (pp. 209-230). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lindström, A. (2015). Orientations to epistemics and deontics in treatment discussions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78: 39 – 53.

Llurda, E., Cots, J.M. & Armengol, L. (2013). Expanding language borders in a bilingual institution aiming at trilingualism. In: H. Haberland, D. Lonsmann & B. Preisler (Eds.). *Language alternation, language choice, and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 203-222). Heidelberg: Springer.

Lüdi, G. & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be... a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6: 154-167.

Macbeth, D. (1990). Classroom order as practical action. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11, 89–214.

Mandelbaum, J. (1996). Constructing social identity in the workplace: Interaction in bibliographic database searches. In H. Mokros (Ed.). *Interaction and Identity* (pp. 145 – 170). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Mandelbaum, J. (2012). Storytelling in conversation, In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis (*pp. 492-508). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Many, J. E. (2002). An exhibition and analysis of verbal tapestries: Understanding how scaffolding is woven into the fabric of instructional conversations. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37: 376-407.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *Modern Language Journal, 88*: 583–596.

Markee, N. (2004) (Ed.). Classroom talks [special issue]. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4).

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (3): 404-427.

Markee, N. & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 88*: 491–500.

Marsh, D. (2002). Content and language integrated learning: The European dimension - actions, trends and foresight potential. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/languages/in dex.html

Maynard, D. W. (1984). *Inside plea bargaining: the language of negotiation*. New York, Plenum Press.

McCafferty, S. G. (1994). Adult second language learners' use of private speech: A review of studies. *The Modern Language Journal,* 78 (4): 421-36.

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

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

Meier, C. [1997] (2002): *Arbeitsbesprechungen. Interaktionsstruktur, Interaktionsdynamik und Konsequenzen einer sozialen Form*. Radolfzell (Verlag für Gesprächsforschung).

Michaelsen, L., Knight, A. & Fink, L. (2002). *Team-based learning: A transformative use of small groups.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Michaelsen, L. & Sweet, M. (2011). Team-based learning. *New Directions For Teaching And Learning*, 128: 41-51.

Mondada, L. (2013). Embodied and spatial resources for turn-taking in institutional multi-party interactions: Participatory democracy debates. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 46 (1): 39–68.

Mondada, L. & Nussbaum, L. (2012) (Eds.). *Interactions cosmopolites: L'organisation de la participation plurilingue.* Limoges: Editions Lambert Lucas.

Mondada, L. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2000). Interaction sociale et cognition située : quels modèles pour la recherche sur l'acquisition des langues, *AILE*, 12: 81-102.

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): 501–18.

Moore, E. (2011). *Plurilingual practices at a Catalan university doing internationalisation: Context and learning*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Moore, E. (2014). Constructing content and language knowledge in plurilingual student teamwork: Situated and longitudinal perspectives*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(5): 586-609.

Moore, E. (2016). Conceptualising 'multilingual' higher education in policies and classroom practice. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 29 (1). DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2016.1132652.

Moore, E., Borràs, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2013). Plurilingual resources in lingua franca talk: An interactionist perspective. In: H. Haberland, D. Lonsmann & B. Preisler (Eds.). *Language alternation, language choice, and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 53-84). Heidelberg: Springer.

Moore, E. & Dooly, M. (2010) 'How do the apples reproduce (themselves)?" How teacher trainees negotiate language, content, and membership in a CLIL science education classroom at a multilingual university. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 9 (1): 58 – 79.

Moore, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2011). Què aporta l'anàlisi conversacional a la comprensió de les situacions d'AICLE. In: C. Escobar & L. Nussbaum (Eds.). *Aprender en otra lengua / Aprendre en una altra llengua* (pp. 93-117). Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la UAB.

Moore, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2014). Building a multilingual university in institutional policies and everyday practices. In: J. W. Unger, M. Krzyżanowski & R. Wodak (Eds.). *Multilingual encounters in Europe's institutional spaces* (pp. 243 – 269). London: Continuum.

Moore, E., Nussbaum, L. & Borràs, E. (2013). Plurilingual Teaching and Learning Practices in 'Internationalised' University Lectures. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 16 (4): 471–493.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics,* 23: 323– 347.

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

Mori, J. & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: a study of interaction between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (2): 195-219.

Nilsson, B. (1999). Internationalisation at home—Theory and praxis. *EAIE Forum*: 12.

Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalisation at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 7 (1): 27-40.

Nussbaum, L. (2006) La transcripción de la interacción en contextos de contacto y de aprendizaje de lenguas. In: Y. Bürki & E. de Steffani (Eds.). *Transcribir la lengua: De la filología al análisis de la conversación* (pp. 195 – 218). Bern: Peter Lang.

Nussbaum, L., Moore, E., & Borràs, E. (2013): Accomplishing multilingualim through plurilingual activities. In: A. C. Berthoud, F. Grin & G. Lüdi (Eds.). *Exploring the dynamics of Multilingualism: The DYLAN project* (pp. 229-252). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nussbaum, L. & Unamuno, V. (2000). Fluidité et complexité dans la construction du discours entre apprenants de langues étrangères. *AILE, 12:* 27-49

O'Donnell, A. & Hmelo-Silver, C. (2013). What is collaborative learning? An overview. In: C. Hmelo-Silver, C. Chinn & A. O'Donnell (Eds.). *The international handbook of collaborative learning* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.

Ohta, A. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In: J. Lantolf (Ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51-78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (Ed.) 2000. *Approches interactionnistes de l'acquisition des langues étrangères*. no spécial d'*AILE,* no. 12 (Acquisition et Interaction en Langue etrangère). Paris, Université Paris VIII

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2002). Mediation revisited: The interactive organization of mediation in learning environments. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 9 (1): 22-42.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, 4 (2): 134–160.

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.). *Conceptualizing 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pekarek Doehler, S. & Fasel Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In: N. Markee (Ed.). *Handbook of classroom interaction.* (pp. 409-424). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2015). Languages for all in education: CLIL and ICLHE at the crossroads of multilingualism, mobility and internationalisation. In: M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.). *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 31-50). Berlin: Springer.

Ploettner, J. (2015). Learning opportunities through a student generated assessment tool. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature,* 8 (4): 62-81.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies,* 9: 219-230.

Pomerantz, A. & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In: T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 64-91). London: Sage.

Psathas, G. (1990). Introduction: Methodological issues and recent developments in the study of naturally occurring interaction. In: G. Psathas (Ed.). *Interactional competence* (pp. 1-30). Washington: University Press of America.

Raymond, G. & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35: 677–705.

Reichert, T. (2016). Research vocabulary development: A conversation analytic approach. *L2 Journal,* 8 (1): 1-17.

Robinson, J. (2013). Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: the case of parial questioning repeats. In: M. Hayashi, G. Raymond & J. Sidnell (Eds.). *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 261-292). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roca-Cuberes, C. (2014). Conversation analysis and the study of social institutions: methodological, socio-cultural and epistemic considerations. *Athenea Digital*, 14 (1): 303-331.

Rogat T., Linnenbrink-Garcia L., DiDonato, N. (2013). Motivation in collaborative groups. In: C. Hmelo-Silver, C. Chinn, C. Chan & A. O'Donnell (Eds.). *International handbook of collaborative learning* (pp. 250-267). New York: Routledge.

Rylander, J. (2009). Repair work in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. In: H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 245-280). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Centre, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Sacks, H. [1965] (1992), *Lectures on conversation*, edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as a social action. In: J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 45-65). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sawyer, R. K. & Berson, S. (2004). Study group discourse: How external representations affect collaborative conversation. *Linguistics and Education, 15*: 387-412.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question'. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50 (3-4): 104-152.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "Uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In: D. Tannen (Ed.). *Georgetown University roundtable on languages and linguistics: Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of "coherence" in talk-in-interaction. In: B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversation organization and its development* (pp 51 - 77). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology,* 98: 1295–345.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In: E. H. Hovy & D. Scott (Eds.). *Computational and conversational discourse: Burning issues – An interdisciplinary account* (pp. 3-38). Heidelberg: Springer.

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

Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Some other "Uh(m)s". *Discourse Processes,* 47 (2): 130–174.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53 (2): 361-382.

Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review,* 33: 46-62.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1976). The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society,* 5: 1-24.

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

Seedhouse, P. (2005). "Task" as a research construct. *Language Learning, 55* (3): 533–570.

Sharma, B. (2013). Enactment of teacher identity in resolving student disagreements in small group peer interactions. *Linguistics and Education*, 24 (2): 247-259.

Silliman, E. R., Bahr, R., Beasman, J. & Wilkinson, L. C. (2000). Scaffolds for learning to read in an inclusion classroom. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 31: 265–279.

Singto, S. (2005). Peer response in college ESL writing classroom. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Georgia in Partial.

Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (2012) (Eds.). Integrating content and language in higher education. Gaining insights into English-medium instruction at European universities. *AILA Review*, 25.

Steinbach Kohler, F. & Thorne, S. L. (2011). The social life of self-directed talk: A sequential phenomenon? In: J. K Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 66–92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Stevanovic, M. & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 45 (3): 297-321.

Stevanovic, M. (2013). Constructing a proposal as a thought: A way to manage problems in the initiation of joint decision-making in Finnish workplace interaction. *Pragmatics,* 23 (3): 519-544.

Stivers, T. (2011). Physician-child interaction: When children answer physicians' questions in routine medical encounters. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 87: 3-9.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L & Steensig, J. (2011). Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: T. Stivers, L. Mondada & J. Steensig (Eds.). *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 3-26). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, T., Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilising response. *Research On Language And Social Interaction*, 43 (1): 3–31.

Stivers, T & Sidnell, J. (2013). Introduction. In: J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.). *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 1-8). Chichester: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Stone, C. A. (1998a). The metaphor of scaffolding. Its utility for the field of learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31: 344–364.

Stone, C. (1998b). Should we salvage the scaffolding metaphor? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31: 409–413.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 153–173.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2005). Contingent requests: Their sequential organization and turn shape. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 38 (2): 159-179.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). *Request sequences: The intersection of grammar, interaction and social context* (Studies in Discourse and Grammar). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. & Huth, T. (2010). L2 requests: An empirical study of L2 learners' orientation to preference structure in talk-in-interaction*. Multilingua,* 29: 185 – 202.

ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage Publications

Terenzini, P. T., Cabrera, A. F., Colbeck, C. L., Parente, J. M. & Bjorklund, S. A. (2001). Collaborative learning vs. lecture/discussion: Students' reported learning gains. *Journal of Engineering Education,* 90 (1): 123-130.

Tharp, R. G. & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life. Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011). Second language interaction for business and learning. In: J. K Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 93-116). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1991). The pragmatic functions of 'I don't know'. *Text,* 11: 607 – 622.

Tykkyläinen, T. & Minna L. (2009). Five-year-old girls negotiating pretend play: Proposals with the Finnish particle *jooko*. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 42 (1): 242–256.

Unterberger, B. & Wilhelmer, N. (2011). English-medium education in Economics and Business studies. Capturing the status quo at Austrian Universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 161: 90-110.

Van Boxtel, C., Van der Linden, J. & Kaanselar, G. (2000). Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge. *Learning and Instruction,* 10: 311–330.

Van de Pol, J., Volman, M. & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction. A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22: 271–296.

Vilkancienė, L. (2011). CLIL in tertiary education: Does it have anything to offer? *Kalbų Studijos* 18: 111-118.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wilkinson R., & Zegers, V. (2008). Introduction. In R. Wilkinson, & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Realizing content and language integration in higher education* (pp. 1-9). Maasricht: Maasricht University.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17: 89–100.

Young, R. & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: negotiating discourse roles in the ESL writing conference. *Modern Language Journal,* 88: 519-535.

Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2011). Pursuing a question: Reinitiating IRE sequences as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*: 475-488.