REFORMULATIONS IN MULTI-PARTY INTERACTIONS IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN A TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

TÜRKİYE'DE BİR YÜKSEK ÖĞRENİM BAĞLAMINDA YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE KULLANILAN ÇOK KATILIMLI ETKİLEŞİMLERDE YENİDEN İFADELEME UYGULAMALARI

Emel TOZLU KILIÇ

Thesis Submitted to Graduate School of Educational Sciences of

Hacettepe University

for the Degree of Master of Arts

in English Language Teaching

2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

in happiness. Endless thanks to him for opening his heart to me, his support and patience in my most difficult times and tolerance for my long working hours. I love you.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to the most important man in my life: my father, Yakup Tozlu, the greatest man in my life. Your little sister has grown up and had a success. I wish you had been able to witness that moment. I which I could hug you and dedicate this success to you by looking at your eyes. Nevertheless, I am sure you are proud of me despite being really far away. I always felt your love and protection with me.

I would like to end this part by acknowledging to all others who have helped me during this process. Thank you all.

To My Father

To Dr. Olcay SERT

REFORMULATIONS IN MULTI-PARTY INTERACTIONS IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN A TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

Emel TOZLU KILIÇ

ABSTRACT

Reformulations are "forms of talk which attribute to some prior speaker words and/or ideas purported to have been authored or implied in some prior talk" (Gonzales 1996, p. 158) and are effective devices for describing, explaining, re-stating or summarising the prior talk (Waring, 2002). Although they have been investigated in a variety of contexts such as psychotherapy (e.g. Davis, 1986; Perakyla & Vehvilainen, 2003; Kurri & Wahlstrom, 2007), radio call-in programmes, (e.g. Hutchby, 1996; Drew, 2003), seminar discussions (e.g. Waring 2002), and other educational contexts (e.g. Kapellidi, 2015; Hauser, 2006), the interactional function of reformulation in L2 learner-learner interaction remains a gap in L2 literature. Keeping this gap in mind, this study aims to document the characteristics of reformulation and learners' orientation to reformulation in an out-of-classroom group discussion task in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Track the phenomenon in multi-party L2 interaction in a Turkish higher education context, this study will investigate the phenomenon through the robust methodological underpinnings of ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis. To provide a micro-analytic investigation of sequential unfolding of reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction, 20 extracts based on a collection of 84 episodes, which were analysed in alignment with the data-driven nature of conversation analytic research methodology, were involved in the study. The audio data comes from discussion tasks designed as out-of-classroom activities for students taking the Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes at Hacettepe University Division of English Language Teaching. The data was collected by Assist. Prof. Dr. Olcay Sert and labelled as L2 Discussion Tasks Corpus (L2DISCO, Sert, 2016; 2017a; b). Participants were all non-native speakers of English except one who was born in Australia, a bilingual Turkish-English speaker. The dataset includes the participants' audio recorded conversations at 6 different times over 1 year and consists of a total of 174 multi-party conversations (average 20 minutes each), which amounts to 58 hours of audio recording. For this study, a sub-corpus of 60 recordings (approximately 1200 minutes) were analysed. The analysis shows that the sequential position of reformulation constitutes three

categories: adjacency pairs (Sacks, 1967; Schegloff, 1968), independent Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) in the second turn and triadic sequence. Additionally, the analysis illustrates that learners employ reformulation to index a variety of actions (i.e. agreement, confirmation, recipiency) as they primarily demonstrate their understanding. In addition, reformulation is produced to provide other-repair and other-correction when a party signals a trouble which can be a word search, a code-mixed utterance, a grammatical mistake or difficulty in formulating an appropriate turn. The findings also suggest that learners' orientations to reformulation bring evidence for their novice and expert roles displayed through reformulations. Reformulations expose learners to the linguistic varieties in a target language and they create their own learning by providing opportunity for a potential uptake of reformulated utterances. Thus, the findings of this study also have some implications for reformulation practices of learners as they can create their learning opportunities through reformulations.

Keywords: Formulation, reformulation, multi-party L2 interaction, learners' orientation to reformulation, conversation analysis

Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Olcay SERT, Hacettepe University, Department of Foreign Languages Education, Division of English Language Teaching

TÜRKİYE'DE BİR YÜKSEK ÖĞRENİM BAĞLAMINDA YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE KULLANILAN ÇOK KATILIMLI ETKİLEŞİMLERDE YENİDEN İFADELEME UYGULAMALARI

Emel TOZLU KILIÇ

ÖZ

Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) tarafından "yaptıklarımızı kelimelerle anlatmak" olarak tanımlanan ifadeleme, bir önceki konuşmayı tanımlama, açıklama, yeniden anlatma veya özetlemek için kullanılan etkili bir araçtır (Waring, 2002). Yeniden ifadeleme, psikoterapi (örn. Davis, 1986; Perakyla & Vehvilainen, 2003; Kurri & Wahlstrom, 2007), radyo çağrı programları, (örn. Hutchby, 1996; Drew, 2003), seminer tartışmaları (e.g. Waring 2002), ve eğitimel bağlamlarda (örn. Kapellidi, 2015; Hauser, 2006) ele alınmasına rağmen, yeniden ifadelemenin etkileşimsel fonksiyonu yabancı dilde öğrenci etkileşimde ele alınmayan bir konu olarak yabancı dil literatüründe bir boşluk oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışma, literatürdeki bu boşluğu göz önünde bulundurarak, yeniden ifadelemeleri öğrenci grup tartışmalarında Türk Yüksek öğrenim bağlamında ele almış ve budun yöntembilimi (etnometodoloji) temelli Konuşma Çözümlemesi yöntemini araştırma yöntemi olarak benimsemiştir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda yabancı dil olarak İngilizcenin kullanıldığı sınıf dışı tartışma çalışmalarını ele almıştır. Yeniden ifadelemenin çok katılımlı yabancı dil etkileşiminde sırasal ortaya çıkışını mikro-analitik olarak araştırmak için toplamda 84 kesit, Konuşma Çözümlemesi yönteminin veri-güdümlü özelliğiyle analiz edilmiş ve 20 tanesine bu çalışmada yer verilmiştir. Sesli olarak kaydedilmiş veri, Hacettepe Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Sözel İletişim Becerileri 1 ve 2 derslerini alan öğrencilerin sınıf dışı yürüttükleri tartışmalardan, Yard. Doç. Dr. Olcay SERT tarafından toplanmış ve L2DISCO (L2 Tartışma Çalışmaları Derlemi) olarak adlandırılmıştır. Avustralya'da doğmuş bir öğrenci hariç katılımcıların tümü İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak kullanmaktadırlar. Veri toplamda 1 yıllık süre içerisinde katılımcıların kendi iletişimlerini kaydetmesi yoluyla 6 farklı zaman diliminde toplanmıştır ve her biri yaklaşık 20 dakikadan oluşan 174 kayıt mevcuttur. Toplam veri boyutu 58 saattir ancak bu çalışmada toplam verinin yaklaşık 1200 dakikası kullanılmış ve 60 kayıt analiz edilmiştir. Analiz sonucunda yeniden ifadelemenin sırasal oluşumu üç kategori olarak belirlenmiştir: sıralı çiftler (Sacks, 1967; Schegloff, 1968), ikinci sırada yer alan bağımsız söz sırası oluşturma birimi (TCU) ve üçlü dizin. Ayrıca, analiz öğrencilerin yeniden ifadelemeleri anladıklarını

göstermenin yanı sıra fikir birliği, onay isteme, dinlediğini gösterme gibi diğer durumları ifade etmek için de kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Bunun yanında, yeniden ifadeleme, iletişimde bir sorun ortaya çıktığında başkası tarafından sağlanan düzeltme ve onarım içinde oluşturulmuştur. Bu sorun bir kelime arama, ana dilde kullanılan bir ifade, dilbilgisi hatası ya da uygun bir ifade dizisi oluşturmakta sorun yaşamak olabilir. Bulgular şunu da ortaya koymuştur ki öğrenciler yeniden ifadelemelere gösterdikleri uyum aynı zamanda yeniden ifadeleme ile ortaya koyulan uzman-acemi rollerini de benimsenmesi anlamına almektedir. Yeniden ifadeleme sayesinde öğrenciler, hedef bir dilin kullanım çeşitliliklerine maruz kalırlar ve yeniden ifadelemeleri alıp kullandıklarında kendi öğrenme fırsatlarını yaratabilirler. Böylelikle, bu çalışmanın bulguları öğrencilerin yeniden ifadeleme uygulamalarının yabancı dil eğitimden kullanılabileceğine dair çıkarımlarda bulunmuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: İfadeleme, yeniden ifadeleme, çok katılımlı yabancı dil etkileşimi, öğrencilerin yeniden ifadelemelere uyumu, konuşma çözümlemesi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

CA: Conversation Analysis

CA-SLA / CA-for-SLA: Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition

CIK: Claim of Insufficient Knowledge

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

IC: Interactional Competence

L2: English as Foreign/Second/Additional Language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TCU: Turn Construction Unit

1. INTRODUCTION

This study aims to describe sequential unfolding of reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction in English as foreign language (L2). In this study, L2 is used to refer to English as a second, foreign and additional language. The purpose of the study is to explore the characteristics and functions of reformulation, and the ways learners show orientation to reformulation by using the conceptual and analytical apparatus of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA). This chapter begins with the presentation of the background of the study with reference to CA. It will be followed by the aim and significance of the study as well as research context and research questions. The chapter will be finalized with the outline of the thesis.

1.1. Background of the Study

The term formulation refers to the practices of interactants "saying-in-so-many-words-what-they-are-doing" (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, p.351). Formulation occurs when interactants describe, explain, characterize, explicate, summarise, or furnish the gist of some part of the conversation, and its primary function is to demonstrate (non)understanding (Davis, 1986). It is the indication of participants' listening to one another and that "their conversation has been an orderly phenomenon, making sense every step of the way" (p. 48).

Formulation paves the way for reformulation, and Davis' work on the problem (re)formulation in psychotherapy is a noteworthy example of this process. In his study, Davis (1986) investigates the transformation process of the client's initial version of her trouble into a therapeutic problem in order to make it something treatable by means of psychotherapy. According to Davis, this transformation process is achieved by special use of everyday conversational device of formulations. Thus, he uses the prefix 're' in parenthesis to emphasize this special transformation, which is well-defined by Kapellidi (2015) as follows:

> *"the prefix 're' emphasizes the change the specific move introduces and its backward orientation, eliminating thereby the obscurity that the notion of 'formulation' causes, given its concurrent application for matters articulated for the first time which do not "link back to some prior version of things talked about" (Deppermann, 2011, cited in Kapellidi, p. 566).*

The contribution of reformulation to interaction has been supported by many researches which will be detailed in the review of literature part (Chapter 2).

Labelling reformulation as recast, a great number of works on reformulation in Second Language Acquisition (henceforth SLA) have addressed the issue of recast in different contexts and categorized recast as an interactional feedback by focusing on its relation to learners' uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998; Ellis, Bastürkmen & Loewen 2001; Nabei & Swain, 2002, Braidi; 2002; Sheen, 2006; Nassaji, 2007). However, SLA studies have been exposed to some criticism as being individualist and mentalist (Kasper & Wagner, 1997, 1998) and also as adopting an etic approach rather than emic. That has led to a call for an increased sensitivity towards emic approach which is also adopted for this present paper. To this end, it would be necessary to highlight the distinction between these two approaches. Pike (1967) defines this distinction as follows:

> [t]he etic viewpoint studies behaviour as from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system. The emic viewpoint results from studying behaviour as from inside the system ... Descriptions or analyses from the etic standpoint are 'alien' in view, with criteria external to the system. Emic descriptions provide an internal view, with criteria chosen from within the system. (cited in Seedhouse 2005, p. 166)

In contrast to SLA studies, putting emic approach at the heart of the analyses, CA-based studies have focused on the phenomenon from the participants' own perspectives (Davis, 1986; Clayman, 1993; Waring, 2002; Hauser, 2006; Chiang & Mi, 2008, 2011; Svenneing, 2013; Kapellidi, 2015). Despite their different settings, these studies have contributed to our understanding of reformulation practices in social interaction, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2. To put it briefly, reformulation is applied to transfer a client's initial version of her/his trouble into a therapeutic problem to be treatable in psychotherapy (Davis, 1986) while it enables to cultivate the collaborativeness in seminar discussion (Waring, 2002). Moreover, reformulation in a question form, namely reformulated question, is mainly employed to show involvement in the topic, to seek common ground with the partner, thereby inviting partnership (Svennevig, 2013). Lastly, in news interviews and press conferences, reformulation serves as "management of a response trajectory and shifting the topical agenda" (Clayman,1993, p. 165).

Additionally, the works by Kapellidi (2015) and Hauser (2006) addressed reformulation from teachers' perspectives while some others investigated it as an embedded repair (Ziegler, Sert & Durus, 2012) as well as a resource for adding emphasis on an utterance in the course of an interaction (Liebscher & Dailey-

O'Chain, 2005). Overall, reformulations have been investigated in a variety of institutional contexts including L2 language learning and teaching practices. Yet, those which are interested in L2 language learning and teaching practices focus either on teachers' reformulation or treat it as a kind of repair embedded in an ongoing interaction occurred as a part of their analytic focus. However, in what ways and why learners employ reformulation as they carry out an interaction with their peers without the presence of any pedagogical goals have been underresearched so far.

Thus, informed by the findings of abovementioned studies, reformulation will be the focus of this current thesis by employing an emic approach to the phenomenon under investigation. In accordance with this aim, methodological background of this study stems from CA which aims to "describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life" (Sidnell 2010, p.1). With the pioneering work of sociologists Sacks and Schegloff, CA emerged as a sociological "naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 289). CA's interest is in social acts and it treats language as a means to perform these social acts. Stemming from ethnomethodology, CA is a multi-disciplinary methodology which interests in analysing naturally-occurring spoken interaction. Thus, it is now applied in various professional and academic areas, one of which is Second Language Acquisition (henceforth SLA). Application of CA for language learning and teaching processes was initiated by the CA-motivated debate on proposed re-conceptualisation of SLA in the late 1990s (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997; Gass, 1998; Markee, 2000, 2002; Van Lier, 2000). Also, Firth and Wagner's (1997, 1998) criticism of SLA as having a narrow database and as being individualist and mentalist has contributed to the reconceptualization process. They invited SLA researchers to their reconceptualization with three major changes in SLA "(a) a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, (b) an increased emic (i.e., participant-relevant) sensitivity towards fundamental concepts, and (c) the broadening of the traditional SLA database" (p. 758). Their invitation for reconceptualization of SLA was granted by many scholars (Markee, 2000; Mondada & Pekarak Doehler, 2004; He, 2004; Hellermann, 2008; Markee, 2008; Markee & Seo, 2009; Hauser, 2013;

Sert, 2013b, 2015; Markee & Kunitz, 2015) and CA-for-SLA emerged as a new inquiry field, on which this thesis is also grounded.

This current study is also conducted with the aim of contributing to CA-for SLA by examining reformulation practices as a part of learners' social interaction by adopting CA's emic approach to the analysis. Consequently, with the aim of contributing to the growing body of research on L2 literature, this recent study has four premises constructing its background: Reformulation, Conversation Analysis, CA-for-SLA and L2 learner- learner interaction, all of which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2. Before reviewing the related studies, the aim and significance of the thesis will be introduced in the following section.

1.2. Aim and Significance

As Drew stresses (2003), "formulating is a generic practice, the devices or objects through which it is realized are shaped by the activities, and thus the settings, in which they are employed" (p. 261). However, the phenomenon has not been under microscope in L2 learner-learner interaction out of classroom settings, namely, its characteristics and functions in multi-party L2 interaction and whether learners' practice of reformulation have any potential to create learning opportunities for learners constitute a gap in the literature. Keeping this gap in mind, this current paper will track the phenomenon in a different context in order to find out how and why they occur in L2 learner-learner interaction. The main reason of adopting CA as a research methodology is that it makes possible to understand how reformulation practices of interactants are achieved on sequential basis and how they orient to reformulations as a part of their social actions. Thus, learners' reformulation practices sine qua non require a comprehensible understanding from their own perspective. To this end, CA's participant relevant (emic) perspective will provide a descriptive power to explicate the phenomenon from learners' perspectives in the sequential pathways of their interaction. Also, as conservation analytic inquiry offers a micro-analytic investigation of interaction, it will provide a detailed investigation of learners' reformulation practices within their social interaction. In the following section, studies on reformulation mentioned above will be reviewed in detail considering the theoretical and conceptual framework of the thesis.

1.3. Research Context and Research Questions

The study will present the analysis of data gathered from discussion tasks designed as out-of-classroom activities for students taking the Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes at Hacettepe University, Division of Foreign Language. The dataset includes the participants' audio recorded conversations at 6 different times over a year. The corpus has been compiled by Assistant Professor Dr. Olcay Sert, and is labelled L2 Discussions Corpus (L2DISCO- Sert 2016; 2017a; b) and consists of a total of 174 multi-party conversations (average 20 mins each), which amounts to 58 hours of audio recording. For this study, a sub corpus of 60 recordings and approximately 1200 minutes were transcribed in detail and data has been analysed in order to seek out answers to the following research questions in alignment with the data-driven nature of conversation analytic research methodology.

1. In what ways do reformulations unfold in multi-party L2 interaction?

    a. How are the reformulations sequentially co-constructed in the interactions by the learners?

    b. What are the interactional and linguistic resources the learners employ in producing reformulations?

2. How do learners show their (non)orientations to reformulations?

1.4. Thesis Outline

The study consists of five main chapters; namely, (1) introduction, (2) literature review, (3) method, (4) analysis and findings, and (5) discussion and conclusion. In this chapter, an overview and purpose of the thesis has been introduced, and in the following chapter, literature review will present the relevant studies that form the background for the current study. Firstly, CA-for-SLA will be introduced, which will be followed by the works on reformulation in L1 and L2. In the third part of the literature review, repair and correction mechanisms will be described from CA perspective. What comes next will be the review of studies on L2 learner-learner interaction.

In Chapter 3, the methodology of the thesis and research design will be presented in general. In 3.1., the purpose of the study and research questions will be given and the participants and research context will be detailed in 3.2. In 3.3., issues on

ethics and data collection procedures will be presented in addition to transcription, building a collection and data analysis. The last section of this chapter will be devoted to introducing CA as an approach and methodology with its analytic principles proposed by the founders and proponents of the field. Accordingly, relevant literature on CA will be reviewed in order to clear the ground in terms of the analytic procedures.

In Chapter 4, the analysis of transcripts and the findings will be presented in two separate subsections. In 4.1., the most common (and frequent) examples of reformulations found in the data will be covered in terms of their sequential positions and the actions they perform in L2 learner-learner interaction. In 4.2., how reformulations are oriented by learners will be described and each section will be concluded with a summary of the main findings.

In the last chapter, the findings will be organised by addressing to sequential organisation and action formation of reformulation (5.1), the linguistic and interactional resources employed by the learners (5.2) and their orientation to reformulation (5.3.). What comes next will be the implications for foreign language education (5.4.). The last section will be a conclusion for the thesis and the presentation of limitations and future direction issues will be discussed. This chapter will be finalized with a conclusion remarks section by the researcher.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will present the related studies and their findings in order to provide a background for this study. In this respect, firstly the impact of conversation analytic examination of L2 interaction on second language acquisition (SLA) literature will be discussed. This will be followed by reformulations in L1 and L2 and the repair and correction in Conversation Analysis and their relevance to language expertise. Also, studies on learner-learner interaction will be under the scope of this chapter.

2.1. CA-for-SLA and Language Learning

As an independent field of inquiry, SLA has attempted to shed light on language, language learning, teaching, and acquisition with various methodologies which approach language from different perspectives such as generativist, cognitivist, or sociocultural. In SLA point of view, learning is seen as an individual process occurring in individuals' minds despite their social engagement. In SLA research, all findings are based on an etic perspective; namely, researchers' perspective basing on pre-determined exogenous theories.

SLA's individualist approach to language learning from an etic perspective was criticised by Firth and Wagner (1997) who define SLA as a field which is becoming "hermetically sealed area of study" (1998, p.92). As Firth and Wagner (1997) point out SLA underestimates learners' collaborative contribution to learning process by neglecting the social and contextual aspects of language use, and it "fails to account in a satisfactory way for interactional and socio-linguistic dimensions of language" (p.285). With their seminal positional paper, Firth and Wagner pinpoint the importance of emic perspective and the social dimension of learning process, and they stress the sensitivity towards contextual and interactional language use by focusing on the data from participants' own perspective. To this end, they propose a re-conceptualization of SLA adopting the principles of ethnomethodological CA which was developed by sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emanuel A. Schegloff in the early 1960s as a sociological "naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 289).

To their reconceptualisation call of SLA, a great contribution is provided by Markee (2000), and with the pioneering of Markee and Kasper, a new field of enquiry for

second language learning and teaching emerged as CA-for SLA (Markee & Kasper 2004) or CA-SLA (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). In CA-for-SLA, social activity and learning are seen "as an eminently local accomplishment emerging from the detailed moment-by-moment deployment of actions and turns at talk within interactionally organized courses of practical activities" (Pekarek Doehler, 2013, p. 139) and evidence for learning are explored via CA's analytic tools such as turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, and preference organization.

According to Markee (2008), "CA-for-SLA shows how participants analyse each other's real time conversational practices to achieve particular social actions (such as language learning behaviours) that occur naturally during talk-in-interaction" (p.405). As an empirical field of study, CA-for-SLA documents micro-moments of learning and understanding within naturally occurring interaction by approaching the data from participants' own perspective, thereby bringing evidence for learning. CA studies have also furthered our understanding of how "[l]earners and teachers construct their identities in and through their talk ... these identities are quite permeable and are deployed by members on a moment-by-moment basis as a resource for making particular types of learning behaviour relevant at a particular moment in a particular interaction" (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496).

The relationship between CA and learning was firstly addressed in 2000s, and to date many publications have been investigated the connection between learning and CA (e.g. Mondada & Pekarak Doehler, 2004; He, 2004; Hellermann, 2008; Markee, 2008; Markee & Seo, 2009; Hauser, 2013; Sert, 2013b, 2015; Markee & Kunitz, 2015). While most of them focus on learning English (e.g. Brouwer and Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2011; Hauser, 2013; Waring 2013; Lee and Hellermann, 2014), there are some other studies on other languages such as French (e.g. Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011), German (e.g. Kasper, 2004), Japanese (e.g. Mori, 2004; Ishida, 2009, 2011), and Korean (e.g. Kim, 2009).

According to Sahlström (2011) "learning is inherently longitudinal; [in] that it involves changes in the practice of individuals occurring over time" (cited in Sert, 2015, p.36). Drawing on that, development of interactional competence (IC) which is defined as "a relationship between the participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the context in which they are employed" (Young, 2008,

cited in Sert, 2015, p. 36), took many scholars' attention (e.g. Hall, 1993; 1999; Ohta, 1999; Young, 2000; 2013; Pallotti, 2001; 2002; Young & Miller, 2004; Nguyen, 2006; Hellermann, 2006; Cekaite, 2007; Yagi, 2007; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Ishida, 2011; Rine & Hall, 2011; Achiba, 2012; Dings, 2014; Balaban, 2016).

However, CA studies for language learning have been exposed to some criticisms. He (2004) states that "CA is not a learning theory" (p. 579) and that "CA is not concerned with what is not observable" (p. 578). According to Hall (2004), these studies are not "successful in making a collective case for CA's potential as an approach to studies of language learning" (2004, p.608). Larsen-Freeman (2004) also note that:

> *"[s]aying that something has been learned, saying what has been learned, when it has been learned, and the reason it has been learned are big challenges for all SLA researchers, cognitivists as well as those who practice CA. Yet these are the challenges which CA researchers must confront if they want to move CA to the centre of the field" (p. 607).*

Influenced by the criticism, which "CA's alleged inability to theorize learning" (Markee, 2008, p.405, Kasper 2006), some researchers of CA-for-SLA have suggested combining it with exogenous theories (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004, Hellermann, 2008; He, 2004). In contrast, there have been other researchers who take the purist stance of CA-SLA (Markee,2008) and they seek out to bring evidence in language learning by observing participants' socially distributed cognition (Schegloff, 1991; Potter & Te Molder, 2005). Thus, two approaches are distinguished as CA-informed and CA-inspired approaches to SLA (Mori & Markee, 2009). While CA-inspired approaches to SLA "tend to favour a relatively purist or CA-native approach to the analysis of learning talk" (p.2), CA-informed approaches to SLA suggest a combination of exogenous theories. Despite different perspectives to describe teaching and learning practices in CA-for-SLA, the findings of both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have furthered our understanding of language learning and teaching practices by adopting the micro-analytic lens of the CA.

Even though there have been many longitudinal CA studies which see language as development in participation across time, the work by Van Compernolle (2010) focuses on moment to moment changes of learners with a micro-genetic developmental perspective. Micro-genetic development refers to "very short-term longitudinal study" (Wertsch 1985, cited in Van Compernolle, 2010, p. 68) and it

steps from Vygotskian sociocultural theory. In his study, Van Compernolle focuses on incidental micro-genetic development during a 35-minutes oral proficiency interview of a learner of French and a teacher, and how they collaboratively construct an object of learning and how an opportunity for development is dialogically negotiated. He shows "the identification of a locus of trouble, mediation as a socio-interactional achievement, and the learner's appropriation of the object of learning into his own interactional repertoire over time" (2010, p.66).

In contrast to other CA studies focusing on development of language use over time, this current study will follow Van Compernolle (2010) and focus on whether learners' reformulation practices have any potential to provide incidental micro genetic development, thereby creating any learning opportunities for learners. To this end, in the following section reformulation will be described with reference to the related studies.

2.2. Reformulation in L1 and L2

Heritage and Watson (1979) define formulations as "important methods used by members for demonstrating that, among other things, the conversation has been and is ongoingly self-explicating" (p. 123), and they divided formulation into two categories as a result of their investigation carried out in a crisis intervention centre, face-to-face telephone interviews, group therapy sessions to examine the general characteristics of reformulation. The first category (i.e. gist formulation) refers to formulations that may serve as clarifications, or as demonstrations of comprehension obtained thus far, and they have three central characteristics such as preserving the related features of the previous utterance, deleting some information already available, and transforming and representing the prior talk. The second type of formulations, namely upshot formulations serve as making implicit things explicit. Heritage and Watson also state that formulations basically occur as adjacency pairs with a preference for agreement/confirmation and they take on a special role to solve any problems occurred in topic management in talk-in-interaction (Heritage & Watson 1979). They also stress that formulations primarily function as demonstrating understanding "presumptively, to have that understanding attended to and, as a first preference, endorsed" (p.138).

Gonzales (1996) defines reformulation as a subcategory of formulation and he describes it as "forms of talk which attribute to some prior speaker words and/or ideas purported to have been authored or implied in some prior talk" (p. 158). As formulations do, reformulations primarily function as maintaining understanding which is at the core of interaction and fundamental to mutual communication. In an interaction, each turn is constructed as a result of understanding and "the orderliness and sequentiality of understanding as a practice embedded in the very continuation of the ongoing action" (Mondana, 2011, p. 543). Thus, it will be necessary to briefly mention how learners demonstrate understanding as they do some other actions on the base of an invented example given below.

1 A: where are you staying

2 B: Pacific Palisades

3a A: oh at the west side of town

vs

3b A: oh Pacific Palisades

(Sacks 1992, p.141, cited in Mondada 2011)

In this example, 3a exemplifies the demonstration of understanding as re-describing the place, which is an act of reformulation, rather than a simple repetition which is the case in 3b. Thus, Sacks (1992) explains 'how understanding is shown' "by pointing to the fact that participants make available different forms of understanding by performing some kinds of operation on the previous turn (Mondana, ibid). As it is shown in the extract above, participants "do showing understanding," while they can do "questioning" or "answering" in conversation (Sacks, ibid).

Heritage and Watson's (1979) work provides a comprehensive characterization of formulations which led to many other studies in different institutional settings. To start with, Davis (1986) investigates a therapy interview to provide an analytic description of the process in which a client's initial version of her/his troubles is transformed into a therapy problem. This transformation is an interactional work achieved by the therapist by using the everyday conversational device of formulations in a special way. In order to obtain a typical therapy problem, the therapist may employ a meta-linguistic-listening (Schwartz, 1979, p. 410), and the

formulation is the reflection of this special kind of listening. Davis calls this process as problem (re)formulation using a prefix 're' in parenthesis to emphasize this special transformation. In his inquiry, Davis (1986) aims to explicate the analytic description of the transformation process in which a client's initial version of her/his troubles was reformulated into a problem suitable for psychotherapy. According to Davis, the transformation of the patient's problem is by no means arbitrary, rather it is the result of considerable interactional 'work' on the part of the therapist, and the process of problem reformulation consists of three analytically distinct stages, which are accomplished primarily by means of the everyday conversational device of 'formulations', which serves the accomplishment of (re)formulation.

In the framework of news interviews, reformulation is dealt with by Clayman (1993) who states that reformulations do not merely repeat the preceding question in a literal, word-for-word manner as a paraphrase does, rather they recast the prior in a way that alters its character. In his work, Clayman (1993) examines the practices that he named as 'question reformulation' in news interviews and press conferences. As a result, he explains the basic features which are characteristically associated with most reformulations.

> *1. The reformulation occurs within a discrete unit of talk which is syntactically disjoined from the ensuing response.*
> *2. The reformulation refers to the preceding question or some aspect of it, and paraphrases or re-presents what was said.*
> *3. The reformulation is asserted as a preface to further talk page.*
> *4. Subsequent talk initially builds upon the reformulation rather than the original question (p. 163-4).*

Clayman (1993) also states that "specifically, reformulations appear in environments where the relationship between 1) what the question is seeking to obtain, and 2) what the response actually provides, is potentially problematic" and question reformulations can manage a variety of interactional objectives, of which the most common are "managing a response trajectory' and 'shifting the topical agenda" (p. 165)

In seminar discussions, Waring (2002) approaches reformulations as one of the three ways of substantive recipiency, which is a specific class of recipient practices. Transcribing data for this study consists of five weekly 1.5-hr meetings of a nine-member (professor included) graduate seminar including the nine members, six of which are native speakers of English and three of whom speak English as a second

language. According to Waring (2002), there are three different ways in which substantive recipiency is accomplished in the data: (a) reformulating, (b) extending, and (c) jargonizing. Furthermore, reformulation is one of the devices which enable the understanding of seminar context as it "allows a third-party hearer to untie an interactional deadlock by pinpointing the heart of a disagreement between another two parties" (p. 475). Reformulation is also one of the multi-party nature of seminar discussion which cultivates collaborativeness, and it is reformulation itself which expresses collaborativeness through conflict resolution.

In another work by Svennevig (2013), reformulations are examined in the form of interrogatives, namely reformulated questions, which provide candidate answers including a list of alternatives to the original question in order to guide the interlocutor in the direction of a relevant response. Svennevig (2013) also seeks out answers to which reformulations hinder the participants' freedom of actions, and whether they have any contributions to a common ground and partnership or they stress the asymmetric relationship between the parties. Data was gathered from video recordings of consultations at various social welfare offices in Norway such as an unemployment office, a job qualifying centre for immigrants and a municipal office assisting immigrants and refugees during their first two years of residence. As a result of the analysis, Svennevig (2013) distinguishes at least three different reformulation practices functioning quiet differently when only the case of reformulations is taken: "the first class consists of reformulations that present candidate answers to the original question, the second consists of synonymous paraphrases, and the third consists of reformulations that change the preference structure of the question" (p.192). His analysis reveals that reformulated questions offering a candidate answer function as two distinct practices. The first one is in the form of turn constructional units which is mainly employed to show involvement in the topic, seek common ground with the partner, thereby inviting partnership. The second one is in the form of interrogatives which interlocutor is guided toward a certain type of response. The latter one generally occurs when the interlocutor has difficulty in producing an answer and a help is provided to the interlocutor to find and formulate an appropriate answer.

Reformulations are also described as a process to reword, rephrase and regulate utterances in a special way with the aim of reducing 'understanding uncertainty'.

(Chiang & Mi, 2008). Chiang and Mi (2008) emphasize the distinction between reformulation and repetition by stating that reformulations offer some linguistic modification to regulate what has been previously said. They state that reformulation is employed as an interactive strategy which participants display and manage their understanding uncertainty. Chiang and Mi (2008) investigate a number of dyadic interactions in office hours between international teaching assistants and American college students to explicate understanding uncertainty. They investigate five interactions ranging from 25 to 45 minutes in length by using conversation analysis to transcribe the audio-taped data. Consequently, based on their local functions in the interactions, six types of reformulations which are deployed by interactants to manage their understanding uncertainty are identified as given below:

> ***Elucidative reformulation:*** *refers to the process in which the preceding utterance is reformulated in such a precise manner as to spell out what is meant in what has just been said.*
>
> ***Elaborative reformulation:*** *refers to the process in which the preceding utterance is reformulated in such an extended manner as to develop a more congruent understanding of what is meant in what has just been said (p.274).*
>
> ***Inductive reformulation:*** *refers to the process in which the preceding utterance is reformulated in such a summarizing manner as to draw a generalization from what has been said (p.275).*
>
> ***Replicative reformulation*** *refers to the process in which the preceding utterance is reformulated in terms of its key information so as to make certain what is said is actually what is meant (p. 276).*
>
> ***Transpositional reformulation:*** *refers to the process by which the preceding utterance is partially reformulated in more comprehensible words so as to make certain what is said refers to what is meant (p.277).*
>
> ***Explicative reformulation*** *refers to the process by which the preceding utterance is reformulated in such an analytic manner as to draw an inference from what has just been said (p.278).*

In another work, Chiang and Mi (2011) investigate the role of the reformulation on displaying interlanguage awareness when a mutual understanding becomes a problem between college students and foreign-born instructors. Their data revealed two types of reformulation: self-reformulation and other-reformulation. While self-reformulation refers to interactant's self-modification in his/her own discourse, other-reformulation refers to an interactant's certain modifications in other speaker's preceding utterances. Self-reformulations are employed to elicit a desired response by making the intended meaning understandable. Other-reformulations are produced to ensure one's reception and to request for clarification and confirmation. Chiang and Mi (2011) argue that all reformulations were not produced to correct linguistic errors made by their non-native instructors on the condition that they did

not endanger the comprehension of course related information. Students reformulated when they had trouble to understand some important course information.

One recent work by Kapellidi (2015) addresses reformulation practices in an instructional setting. She investigates the realization of reformulation in the frame of school interaction from a conversation analytic perspective by focusing on how reformulations are accomplished in the classroom. She classifies the teacher's reformulations of students' answers into two broad categories, based on his epistemic access to what is reformulated. The first category represents "the reformulations of matters that belong to the teacher's primary epistemic domain" and the second one comprises "reformulations of matters to which the teacher has no access" (p. 588). Her study demonstrates that these two types of reformulations also occur as two different activities of interaction: instruction and discussion. Instruction falls into the first category in which the teacher aims to achieve his pedagogic agenda through enhancing students' linguistic resources, the other category occurs as discussion in which the teacher displays his understanding to ensure the intersubjectivity of interaction. Thus, she concludes that interactional work in a particular setting with its particular phase shapes the practice of reformulation.

Code switching is regarded as a kind of reformulation by Alfonzetti (1998) and similarly Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2005) define it as "a strategy by which bilingual speakers reformulate the same utterance in a different code" (p. 237). This type of reformulation will be exemplified with the extract below:

```
1 TR: also es muß mehr dazu geben um das (.) linguistik zu nennen

        well there must be more to it in order to call that (.) linguistics

2 S1: so vielleicht wie man (.) ¨ahm (.) die fachsprache benutzt?

        so maybe how you use (.) um (.) the scientific language?

3 TR: wie man die fachsprache benutzt?

        how you use the scientific language?

4 S1: miteinander? (.) with each other?

        with each other? (.) with each other?

5 TR: mm-hmm (.) okay
```

This kind of reformulation was investigated by Ziegler et al. (2012) as one of the teacher's next turn management of student-initiated multilingual resources. In their study, they investigate the use of multilingual resources by plurilingual participants in a public school in Luxembourg, where English is an additional language. Based on video-recorded interactions, they present how the next turn of student-initiated multilingual resources use is managed by teacher through modified repetition, monolingual reformulation and meta-talk about language. In their analysis, they present that teacher deploys reformulation as an embedded repair rather than sanctioning the use of multilingual resources. They also underline the function of reformulation as a resource for adding emphasis, which is compatible with Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain's argument.

In a foreign language classroom, Hauser (2006) investigates reformulation in which a corrected language use is presented. He addresses teacher reformulation in a three-part sequence which is labelled as IRF sequences, that is Initiation-Response-Feedback (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) or as Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) (Mehan, 1979). The practice of teacher's reformulation in language classroom setting is exemplified in the given extract below:

```
01 YAS: She can't accustom (1.4) his country. (0.9) (and but) (0.5) he
02      (casn't) (0.5) accustom (0.7) her country (.) too.
03 TEA: Yea:h so she doesn't think (0.3) that she can become accustomed
04      (0.3) to his country, (0.6) an:, she also doesn't think that he
05      could become (0.3) become accustomed to her country. right?
```

(Hauser, 2006, p.95),

Hauser (2006) claims that F- component does not primarily accomplish feedback or evaluation, rather it is the part in which a reformulation and the R- component's corrected version is presented. Thus, students have an opportunity to meet the model of the language form that they may be able to learn.

All these abovementioned studies have enriched our insight into the general characteristic, functions of reformulation and the logic that lies behind the process of reformulation in different institutional settings. As for educational setting, studies on reformulation are not limited to the works discussed thus far. In contrast, SLA

literature has a great number of studies on reformulation as one of the corrective strategies employed by the teachers to address learners' erroneous utterances. SLA studies label the terms as recast and they only focus on corrective function of the notion. Lyster and Ranta (1997) define recast as "teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error" (p. 46). Similarly, Sheen (2006) stresses that "a recast consists of the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance that contains at least one error within the context of a communicative activity in the classroom" (p. 365).

And a final definition is provided by Long (2006):

> *A corrective recast may be defined as a reformulation of all or part of a learner's immediately preceding utterance in which one or more nontarget-like (lexical, grammatical, etc.) items are replaced by the corresponding target language form(s), and where, throughout the exchange, the focus of the interlocutors is on meaning not language as an object (cited in Baleghizadeh & Abdi, 2010, p.60).*

The common point in all these four definitions is that they all define the term recast as an act of reshaping the students' utterances, including some errors, by the teacher even though they differ in terms of their focus on form or meaning. It is clear that reformulation has always been approached as a correction in SLA studies and how learners addresses to reformulation has always been undiscovered because of the etic perspective SLA adopts. Thus, a qualitative analysis is necessary to enrich our understanding of how learners interactionally organize reformulation by focusing on learners' own perspective.

In their work, Fazel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013) also stress the necessity of such a qualitative analysis in order to understand whose attention focus (the teacher's, the learner's, or a joint focus) is observed when a corrective feedback is produced in a focus on form instruction. They argue this with an example of a clear-cut case in which teacher produces a recast and draws the student's attention to form, thereby obtaining a joint focus on that form. They claim that "such clear-cut cases, however, are by no means the norm" (p. 326) and state the turn-by-turn analysis to observe participants' focus on form. Drawing on that, this paper will also seek out answer whether reformulations have any roles in drawing learners' attention to a particular form or correction without the presence of a teacher authority. To this end, the conceptual and analytic apparatus of Conversation Analysis can be effective to explore the sequential pathways of learners' reformulation in their interaction by basing on its case-by-case, bottom up and

participant-relevant, emic perspective. Therefore, as reformulations can be deployed as repair and correction mechanisms by learners, it would be necessary to explain repair and correction from CA perspective to make their relevance to the remedial function of reformulations. In line with this, in the following section repair and correction will be introduced from CA perspective but the focus will be mostly on other-initiated other-repair, more specifically other-correction, in which reformulation is presented as a repair resource by another party.

2.3. Other-Repair, Other-Correction, and Relevance to Language Expertise

In CA perspective, reformulation is regarded as a kind of repair embedded in the social actions and it can unfold in the interaction without the presence of an apparent error. Repair is the treatment of trouble which impede the communication and according to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), who are the pioneers of this domain, "nothing is in principle excludable from the class repairable" (p. 363). Repair allows interactants to continue the interaction when a trouble arises, therefore maintaining intersubjectivity in an ongoing interaction.

A distinction is provided in terms of the initiator and completer of repair, which leads to four different types: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and self-initiated other-repair. Self-initiated self-repair refers to an interactant's initiation of a repair and completing it. Kitzinger (2013) explains self-initiated-self repair as follows:

> *"a current speaker stops what s/he is saying to deal with something which is being treated as a problem in what S/he has said, or started to say, or may be about to say- for example, cutting off the talk to replace a word uttered in error with the correct word." (p. 230)*

In contrast, in other initiated-other repair, another party initiates repair and completes it instead of the interactant of the trouble source. In other-initiated self-repair, the trouble initiated by another interactant is finalized by the speaker of the trouble source, and the case is exact opposite in self-initiated other-repair.

Correction is a particular type of repair in which a trouble item is replaced with another item. As McHoul (1990) states "repair is a general sequential phenomenon of which corrections as such form just one part" (p. 350). In other words, corrections form a part of repair trajectories and the relationship between repair and correction is provided by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) as follows:

> *Repair . . . is a generic term which is used in CA to cover a wide range of phenomena, from seeming errors in turn-taking . . . to any of the forms of what we commonly would call 'correction'—that is, substantive faults in the content of what someone has said. (cited in Seedhouse 2007, p.530)*

Hauser (2003) states both self-correction and other correction can be seen as a subset of a repair. Parallel to Hauser, they are treated as subcategories of repair in this study and named as embedded correction which refer to "corrections done in the context of conversational actions" in CA literature (Seedhouse, 2004, p.152). Put otherwise, embedded correction is the interactionally organized form of recast and it is regarded as a sub-category of repair. The term embedded correction goes back to the work by Jefferson (1987) in which she named embedded correction as a procedure or device for repairing a problematic item in ongoing talk. In other words, she defined embedded correction as "by-the-way occurrence in some ongoing course of talk" (p. 95). According to Seedhouse (2004), embedded correction is one type of repair used in meaning and fluency context whose focus is on fluency rather than accuracy. In this context, repair serves to accomplish mutual understanding and negotiation of meaning in order to repair breakdowns in communication. This type of repair is so similar to those in ordinary conversations. Seedhouse (2004) presents eight categories of the strategies for conducting repair without using direct negative evaluation, two of which include the practice of reformulation. The first one is "to supply a correct version of the linguistic forms*",* which is a kind of other-initiated other-repair (p. 166). This category refers to replacement of the erroneous form with a correct form. The second category is "to accept the incorrect forms and then supply the correct forms" which is also a type of other-initiated other-repair (p.167). This category refers to repeating the incorrect version and then supplying a correct version of the erroneous forms as an alternative. Following Seedhouse's (2004) categorization, the focus will be mostly on other-initiated other-repair and more specifically other-correction, which has been investigated in various CA studies (Firth, 1996; Wrong, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, Hosoda, 2006; Kurhila, 2001; Norrick, 1991; Wilkinson, 2002; Dings, 2014).

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), other-repair may be generally relevant to the interactions of 'not-yet-competent' speakers and some scholars investigated the relevance of other repair to language expertise between native and foreign/ second language speaker interaction. For instance, drawing on a database of 13 hours of video-recorded interactions of first and second language speakers of Finnish, Lilja

(2014) focuses on other-initiated repair sequences initiated by a second language speaker by repeating a part of the trouble source turn to indicate specific language-related problems of understanding. Basing on the analysis, Lilja suggests that "the linguistic asymmetry in second language interactions is a resource that is drawn upon in situations in which other resources for action formation and recognition are not sufficient" (p. 98). The analysis also illustrates how problematic words, the lexical items which have to be understood to continue the interaction, are developed into learning objects.

Such a linguistic asymmetry between the participants is focused by Dings (2012) who examines the interlocutors' orientation to their roles as novice and expert, and how they co-construct this dynamic, and how this dynamic evolves over the course of the year. By analysing six conversational interactions between a native speaker and a non-native speaker of Spanish, Dings (2012) exemplifies the contexts in which correction occurs in the conversational moves and shows corrective repair and discussion of language learning behaviours as evidence of participants orientations to novice and expect paradigm. Also, Dings (2012) claims that orientation to the expert/novice dynamic and movement away from this dynamic over time can be regarded as the evidence of the novice's trajectory from peripheral towards full participation in interaction. The interaction between these dyads created opportunity for the non-native novice to employ her developing communicative skills under the supervision of the native speaker expert who could provide a model, repair, clarification, and other forms of support as needed in their communication practices.

Similarly, Hosoda (2006) examines an ordinary conversation between bilingual friends and speakers of Japanese and English and focuses on repair and correction sequences to explore their relevance to differential language expertise. In her study, she makes language expertise relevant "(a) when one participant invited the other party's repair and (b) when the participants encountered a problem in achieving mutual understanding" (p. 25). Hosoda (2006) provides evidence for differential language expertise by analysing the interlocutors' orientation to the differences in their linguistic knowledge through their interaction. Her analysis exemplifies participants' orientations to differences in linguistic expertise between them. Also, Hosoda points out that, through their ordinary conversations, L2 speakers assumed the novice role on occasion that they seek help on L2 vocabulary and repeat

corrected words and L1 speaker takes on expert roles when they supply lexical items and pursues L2 speakers' uptake. Thus, she stresses that the structures of the participants' ordinary L1–L2 conversation is likely to bear similarities to those of language classrooms in terms of dealing with problems in the talk. She claims that opportunities for L2 learning arise either inside or outside of formal teaching settings when differential expertise in the target language is oriented by participants.

As Hosoda (2006) puts forward, "instances of repair can be found when there is no apparent error (e.g. word searches)" (p.27). In this study, when participants engage in word search, repair is provided by the other party and this is generally followed by learners' uptake. To this end, word search is treated as a trouble in the scope of this study to be examined as a part of other-repair trajectory and it is related to language expertise. Such a case is examined by Reichert and Liebscher (2012) who investigated how learning opportunities are linked to the negotiation of expertise in peer interaction when they engage in word search sequences. They claim that the negotiation of expert positions is a necessary precondition for learners to engage collaboratively in constructing learning opportunities.

In the light of the findings of these studies, it is safe to say that other repair trajectories can be linked to language-expert position of interactants. However, one important point is that all these studies focus on native and non-native interaction. Even though other repair will be one of the foci in this study to explore its relevance to learners' orientation to novice-expert roles, this paper is different in terms of the participants who initiate and carry out repair trajectories. In other words, interactants are the learners who have similar instructional background and are the foreign speakers of English except one who was born in Australia. Thus, their interaction may reveal different evidence in relation to other-repair and its relevance to language expertise. To this end, it would be appropriate to review a number of studies focusing on peer interaction, which will be the topic of the following section.

2.4. L2 Learner-Learner Interaction

This study also focuses on learners' group discussion tasks designed as out-of-classroom activities for students taking the Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes. These discussion tasks were designed for students in addition to the classroom discussions for practice with the aim of providing opportunities for

interacting in the target language out of classroom environment with the presence of teacher. Thus, in this section studies focusing on peer interaction organized with a task either in or out of classroom will be reviewed to enrich our insight into peer interaction. However, it would be appropriate to provide a brief definition of task which creates interactional practice opportunities for learners to interact in a target language. According to Nunan (1989), broadly a task is "a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is primarily focused on meaning rather than on form" (p.10). As the interaction plays a crucial role in language learning, effective integration of tasks into teachers' pedagogical agenda is an inevitable part of language classroom to encourage peer interaction and many scholars have dealt with the use of tasks in peer interactions. To give an example, a recent conversational analytic study is carried out by Jakonen and Morton (2015) focusing on epistemics in interaction, which "refers to how participants display, manage, and orient to their own and others' states of knowledge" (p.73). They traced the Epistemic Search Sequences (ESSs) in peer interaction during the completion of pedagogic tasks in a content-based language classroom by following three different types of ESS: "those in which a 'knowing' response is accepted by the initiator of the sequence; those in which there is an 'unknowing' response; and those where 'knowing' responses are contested" (p.73). Their study has many implications for understanding peer interaction in content-based classrooms. They also found that peer interaction bears some differences from the learning objects identified by the teacher's agenda or the curriculum in terms of knowledge gaps, or 'learnables' (Majlesi & Broth 2012, cited in Jakonen & Morton, p. 90).

Another CA work on peer interaction is conducted in a plurilingual context by Ziegler Durus, Sert and Family (2015) who examine collaborative construction of target language (English) in joint writing activities by plurilingual students in a European School in Luxemburg. According to the analysis, students from different nationalities deploy their plurilingual repertoires to construct texts in the target language.

As Kasper and Wagner (2014) suggest, "L2 speakers' interactions in everyday encounters allow us to observe how the participants contingently generate learning opportunities while pursuing the activity at hand" (p. 25). Accordingly, some other researchers conducted studies based on emergent and situated learner-learner

interaction without the interference and presence of a teacher to explore how they manage their own learning and developmental process in a target language. Such a recent study has been conducted on an online task based environment by Balaban and Sert (2017) who conduct a longitudinal study to track the changes in students L2 interactional competence. By bringing evidence from the changes in learners epistemic positioning, their findings revealed the learners' L2 interactional competence.

Reichert and Liebscher (2012) also adopt CA methodology to investigate how learners create learning opportunities in their interaction with the absence of a teacher. They aim at revealing the relationship between language learners' negotiation of expert positions and their learning opportunities within the context of word searches and their findings bring evidence for such a relationship. One remarkable finding is that unlike teacher-student or native speaker-non-native speaker interaction, students do not immediately orient to a candidate word provided by their peers, and they request authoritative source of information.

Drawing on the findings of these studies, it can be strongly argued that learners can create their own learning opportunities in target language when they are given the chance to take the responsibility of their interaction. Following Kasper and Wagner's (2014) suggestion mentioned above, this thesis deals with L2 speakers' interactions to observe how learners contingently generate learning opportunities while accomplishing the discussion task at hand. However, in contrast to some reviewed studies that are interested in classroom environment, this study will take a similar stance to Reichert and Liebscher's (2012) work in terms of giving the participants the chance to interact without a linguistic authority of a teacher. As Melander and Sahlström (2009) point out "we cannot possibly restrain the understanding of learning as still located solely within contexts of encounters between more and less experienced people" (p.1535).

Accordingly, this study also puts L2 learners' interactions into the centre of investigation to observe their social conversations as a part of their discussion tasks. As Melander and Sahlström (ibid) state, learners do not have any established differences pertaining to epistemic or moral authority on the subject and their interaction will be under investigation to track a phenomenon, namely reformulation, which has been unsought from learners' perspectives. In other words, the present

study will be an attempt to bridge a gap in the literature by describing learners' reformulation practices. In line with this aim, CA has been adopted as research methodology to uncover learners' actions through observing and describing turn-taking, repair, and preference organisation practices. Consequently, the following chapter is devoted to defining all methodological aspects of the study by providing detailed information about CA as a research methodology.

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, related studies which are relevant to this thesis have been reviewed. In the first section CA-for-SLA was introduced and in the second section, studies on reformulation in L1 and L2 were presented. It was followed by the definition of other-repair and other correction and the presentation of their relevance to langue expertise with some studies. The section was finalized with L2 learner- learner interaction and the following section is devoted to methodology used in this thesis.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter will provide details regarding the method used, context and participants, data collection tools and the analytic framework. In 3.1., the purpose of the study and research questions will be introduced, and in 3.2., participants and research context will be presented. Ethical considerations and data collection procedure will be detailed in 3.3., while transcription, collection and analysis processes will be handled in 3.4. The reasons for adopting conversation analysis as an approach and methodology to investigate learners' interaction will be justified in 3.5. and this chapter will be concluded with validity (3.6.) and reliability issues (3.7.).

3.1. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

As discussed in the literature review section, many scholars have investigated reformulation in different institutional settings. While some described the characteristics of the phenomenon, some others focused on the functions of it. In SLA literature, it was labelled as recast and considered as a corrective strategy employed by teachers in language classroom setting. However, there have been limited number of studies investigating the phenomenon in L2 language learning and teaching practices from a CA perspective. Considering the gap in the literature, it is safe to say that the characteristics of reformulations have been underresearched in multi-party L2 interaction, on which the originality and significance of this thesis has been built. Therefore, this thesis will be a new attempt to investigate the phenomenon in learners' group discussions from CA perspective. To this end, the conceptual and analytical apparatus of Conversation Analysis is employed as a research methodology and all the claims for the phenomenon being investigated are based on learners' turn-taking, repair, and preference organisations in interaction. Accordingly, this thesis will seek out answers to the following research questions:

1. In what ways do reformulations unfold in multi-party L2 interaction?

    a. How are the reformulations sequentially co-constructed in the interaction by the learners?

    b. What are the interactional and linguistic resources the learners employ in producing reformulations?

2. How do learners show their (non)orientation to reformulations?

The first research question will describe the actions which is formed by reformulation in multi-party discussions by paying attention to the sequential unfolding of reformulation. This question will also address the linguistic and interactional resources learners resort to while they construct their reformulations. The second question will be a further step by addressing learners' orientation to reformulation practices. In the following section, detailed information will be provided to describe the participants and research context.

3.2. Participants and Research Context

The data of this study was collected at Hacettepe University Division of English Language Teaching which has been sustaining educational services since 1982 aiming to train teachers who are to work at primary, secondary and higher education in public and private sectors. Data collection process includes 2015-2016 academic year and participants were all non-native speakers of English except one who was born in Australia, a bilingual Turkish-English speaker. They were undergraduate students at Hacettepe University and their ages range from 18 to 20. English is the medium of instruction in the undergraduate program which includes the fields of language, linguistics, culture, literature and mostly language teaching.

All of the participants have similar backgrounds in terms of English instruction, grammar and vocabulary based education, little or no emphasis on speaking and listening. They start learning English from the 4th grade in primary school following primary, secondary and high school curricula prepared by Ministry of National Education. They are accepted to university according to two central placement exams prepared and administered by the Student Selection and Placement Centre (ÖSYM). One of the tests is called Foreign Language Exam (YDS) which consists of 80 multiple-choice questions. These questions are mostly designed to test students' grammar, vocabulary and reading proficiencies. Therefore, their proficiency levels in listening, speaking, and writing skills are not as high as those in reading, vocabulary and grammar. Their first year in the department is designed to develop their language skills to increase their language proficiency levels. Accordingly, the data was gathered from one of their courses which addresses to develop students' oral proficiencies through a year.

The data collected for this study comes from a database of group discussion tasks designed by Assist Prof. Dr. Olcay SERT as the instructor of the Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes. Students who were taking the Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes were involved in these discussion tasks as out-of-classroom activities. In this class, in addition to the classroom discussions for practice, students, in fixed groups, need to record their conversations at 6 different times using audio recorders or their mobile phones. The corpus of the study is the transcriptions of these audio recordings which reflect longitudinal language use of the participants in these discussion tasks over 1 year. The corpus has been compiled by Assist Prof. Dr. Olcay SERT and is labelled L2 Discussions Corpus (L2DISCO- Sert, 2016; 2017a; b). The corpus is around 400,000 words in size, and consists of a total of 174 multi-party L2 conversations (average 20 minutes each), which amounts to 58 hours of audio recording. The researcher was a member of L2DISCO research team organized by Olcay SERT and she was allowed to build a sub-corpus of 16 groups and approximately 1200 minutes for this study. Before moving on transcription and collection issues, ethical considerations and data collection procedure will be introduced in the following section.

3.3. Ethical Considerations and Data Collection Procedure

The data in this thesis was gathered as a part of Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 courses. Before the data collection, ethical procedure was followed by Olcay SERT and, research ethics committee approval was taken from Hacettepe University on the 1st September 2015 (See Appendix 1). Following the ethical consideration, data collection procedure was initiated in parallel with the methodology adopted. Rather than an etic approach, CA was defined as research methodology thanks to its emic perspective. The differences between CA and other approaches were emphasized by Ten Have (2007) as follows:

1. *CA operates closer to the phenomena than most other approaches.*
2. *CA favours naturally occurring data as opposed to experimental ones that are set up by researchers*
3. *CA sees interaction as organisational and procedural.*
4. *CA should be seen as a study of languages-used, focusing on oral language used in natural situations, rather than in terms of a linguistic system "strictly following normative rules of correct usage" (ten Have ibid., as cited Sert, 2011, p.6).*

Before mentioning data collection procedure, it would be appropriate to describe CA's methodological steps which are described by (Kasper & Wagner, 2014)

1 Collecting naturally occurring data[1], "that is, data in which participants do whatever consequential business they do" (p. 6*)*

2 Transcribing the data "according to notation rules, which have become increasingly detailed in order to support an expanding range of analytic projects" (p.6)

3 Attending a data session in which data is watched and listened repeatedly to find out a new phenomenon

4 Constructing "a collection of comparable instances and develop a precise description of the phenomenon" (p. 6*)*

As the first step, data collection process involved two semesters with the participation of 104 undergraduate freshman students. These students were assigned to work in group of three or maximum four to discuss a topic they were going to choose from a given list as a part of Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 courses in 2015-2016 academic year. They carried out their discussion at six different times throughout two semesters. They were required to discuss the topic at least 20 minutes and topics range from the gap between the rich and the poor to same sex marriage. Students discussed the topics in groups of three or maximum four and they audio-recorded their discussion with a recording device such as their smart phones. Discussions were carried out in an environment the learners decided out. At the end of the process, 58 hours of audio-recorded data was drawn from 174 multi-party discussion tasks.

In CA research, one of the utmost important issues is the anonymity of the participants. That was ensured by using abbreviations of their names, and if they address each other with their names in the discussion in the data, they were changed with pseudonyms name (e.g. Jack instead of John). In the following

---

[1] The data was collected by Olcay SERT as a part of Oral Communication Skills 1 and 2 classes at Hacettepe University in academic years 2015-2016.

section, the transcription process, building up a collection and the analysis of the data will be described in detail.

3.4. Transcription, Building a Collection, and Data Analysis

Transcription plays a crucial role in the analysis. Hepburn and Bolden (2013) stress the importance of the transcription as that detailed transcription is necessary "to discover and describe orderly practices of social action in interaction" to reveal the emic perspective of the participant with all details hidden to contribute to the reliability of the methodology (p. 57). Transcriptions are the orthographic representations of data in communication research (Sert, 2013a), and Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) emphasize the importance of transcription of data within two respects:

> *"First, transcription is a necessary initial step in enabling the analysis of recorded interaction in the way that CA requires. Secondly, the practice of transcription and production of transcript represent a distinctive stage in the process of data analysis itself." (p. 69)*

Before giving details of the transcription, collection and data analysis process, it would be necessary to mention some other basic steps which were also listed by Sert (2011), as follows:

1. *Watching (listening in this case) the whole data set numerous times,*
2. *Starting the initial, less detailed transcriptions with an unmotivated look and taking notes of initial observations,*
3. *Locating an action sequence after initially deciding on the phenomenon to be investigated,*
4. *Examining the action sequences in terms of turn taking, repair, and preference organisation,*
5. *Detailed transcriptions (including visual, nonverbal phenomena) of most interesting cases,*
6. *Building a collection and carrying out detailed analyses. (p,51)*

Transana, which offers tools available for the qualitative analysis of text, still image, audio, and video data (Woods, 2010), was chosen as software programme, and all the details such as pauses, gaps, intonations, overlaps, stretches, stress, researcher's notes were transcribed via a commonly used transcription system adapted from Gail Jefferson (2004). The transcript conventions list is available in Appendix 3.

After 'reformulation' was defined as the phenomenon for this thesis, the most representative cases were defined and transcribed in detail. Following this, a

collection which consists of 84 cases were created. 20 extracts out of 84 have been defined as the most representative sequences for the analysis based on sub-corpus in this thesis to reveal the different characteristics of reformulation in multi-party interaction.

Following the third step mentioned above, two sequences from the sub-corpus were presented and analysed in two different times in Conversation Analysis data sessions held weekly every Thursday at 3:00 p.m. under the directory of Assistant Professor Olcay SERT at Hacettepe University HUMAN research centre, which is dedicated to research on social interaction in institutional settings, mainly using a conversation analytic framework.

The following section will present detailed information on CA, and the reasons of adopting it as a method and approach in this thesis will be justified.

3.5. Conversation Analysis

With the pioneering work of sociologist Harvey Sacks and Emanuel A. Schegloff in the early 1960s, Conversation Analysis "has evolved from ethnomethodology, a sociological approach that challenged sociology's standard epistemology" (Kasper and Wagner, 2011, p. 117). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) define CA as a "naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally" (p.289).

Schegloff (1991) stated that CA gives access to socially distributed cognition (cited in Seedhouse, 2004) and it gives access to "socially distributed language learning" (Seedhouse, 2004). Although it takes its roots from ethnomethodology which studies "the common-sense resources, practices, and procedures through which members of a society procedure and recognize mutually intelligible objects, events and courses of action" (Liddicoat, 2007, p.2), as an approach to the talk-in-interaction, CA has its own principles and the four basics are those defined by Seedhouse (2005):

> *1. There is order at all points in interaction: Talk in interaction is systematically organized, deeply ordered and methodic.*
>
> *2. Contributions to interaction are context- shaped and context- renewing. Contributions to interaction cannot be adequately understood except by reference to the sequential environment in which they occur and in which the participants design them to occur. They also form part of the sequential environment in which a next contribution will occur.*

3. No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant (Heritage 1984a, p. 241): CA has a detailed transcription system, and a highly empirical orientation.

4. Analysis is bottom- up and data driven: the data should not be approached with any prior theoretical assumptions, regarding, for example, power, gender, or race; unless there is evidence in the details of the interaction that the interactants themselves are orienting to it (cited in Sert and Seedhouse, 2011, p. 1).

More details will be given below about these four principles of CA which provide a basis for the analysis in this study. As the first principle suggests, a systematicity lies behind the talk in interaction, and it is not arbitrary and disordered as Chomskyan understanding claims. Considering the second item, participants make sense of each other's turn and the following contribution is shaped by the participants understanding of each other's. In other words, a next turn in the interaction is constructed on the previous turn by bringing evidence in participants' understanding, which constitutes one of the basic premise of CA: next turn proof procedure. Therefore, in this thesis, the sequential unfolding of reformulation will be explored by focusing on the systematicity in learners' talk and by tracing the proof in the learners' next turns. Any evidence to the phenomenon will be brought by analysing participants' perspective, namely from emic perspective. Adopting an emic perspective in analysing social interaction which "requires that only participants' orientations to each other's utterances should be used to make claims on social phenomena, rather than their given identities (e.g. teacher, French, Muslim etc.), the researcher's assumptions, or a priori etic (i.e. exogenous, external) theories" (Sert, 2015, p.10).

As the third principle suggests, detailed transcription plays a crucial role in capturing all details of talk. However, as Sert (2011) underlines, "a perfect match between transcription and the recordings cannot be possible" (p.46). As the last principle suggests, the analysis is free from any interpretations or exogenous theories and it is only data-driven. Also, the analysis is excluded from any assumption regarding participants' identities or any other characteristics.

Of the basic notions of conversation analytic perspective, adjacency pairs and repair need special consideration for the analysis in this study. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) defines adjacency pair as follows:

"given the recognisable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type the first is recognisably a member of." (p. 295)

Basically, an adjacency pair consists of two main parts: first pair and second pair parts. They can be constructed as a question–answer, invitation–declination, offers and denial, request and granting and so on. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) state that "certain first pair parts make alternative actions relevant in second position" (p.46), and these next actions can be marked as (dis)preferred.

There are two sister concepts in CA which constitutes turns in an interaction: Turn Construction Unit (henceforth TCU) and Transitional relevance place (TRPs). TCU refers to a coherent and self-contained utterance such as sentences, clauses, phrases, and individual words that are recognizable in the context as possible complete" (Clayman, 2013, p. 151). While a single unit forms a turn, a single turn can include multiple TCUs. Transitional relevance place (TRPs) is another turn building block which signals the possible change of speakership.

One of the important concept of CA is repair which refers to a mechanism to overcome any trouble in the flow of interaction. Any interruption which interferes with the orderliness of the course of an interaction can lead to a trouble including such things as "misarticulations, malapropism, use of a 'wrong' word, unavailability of a word when needed, failure to hear or to be heard, trouble on the part of the recipient in understanding, incorrect understanding by recipients" (Schegloff, 1987, as cited in Kitzinger, 2013 p.229). When an interactional trouble occurs, interactants employ repair mechanism to restore intersubjectivity. As detailed in Section 2.3., there are four types of repair employed by the interactants: self-initiated self -repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. This categorisation is obtained with respect to who initiates and who completes the repair. Anything can be repairable in an interaction. Interactants initiate repair when they have problem in hearing, comprehension and providing the continuity of talk. Thus, repair mechanism has a vital role in order to maintain mutual understanding, thereby intersubjectivity.

All these basic notions introduced above provide a crucial role in describing the characteristics and the sequential unfolding of reformulation in learner interaction to provide a close investigation to track the phenomenon. Yet, repair needs a special consideration for this thesis as reformulation is frequently employed by the learners as a repair source.

To put it briefly, CA adopts an emic perspective and analyses the data in the light of sequence organization, turn taking, repair and accomplishing intersubjectivity by bringing evidence basing on next-turn-proof-procedure, which refers to searching evidence for the phenomenon in previous and following lines in the sequentiality of the interaction. It is free from any codes, theories and identities defined in advance, it only deals with the details whose evidence can be revealed from the data. It presents data with all details in it, thereby making it possible to test the validity of data all the time. Furthermore, CA allows researchers a completely data-driven systematic investigation in naturally occurring interaction by bringing evidence from the participants contributions, and thanks to its emic perspective, no prior assumption or theories are permitted to interfere with the analysis. All these characteristics and the principles make CA reliable and its validity is accomplished thanks to its emic approach (Seedhouse, 2005). To this end, CA has been adopted as a research methodology to track learners' reformulation practices.

"Reliability and validity are technical terms that refer to objectivity and credibility of research" (Peräkylä, 2011, p. 366) and CA has always been exposed to a criticism of using a limited database which creates a limitation for the validity of its finding (ten Have, 2007). Thus, the following two sections (3.6. and 3.7.) were devoted to the validity and reliability issues in CA.

3.6. Validity

"Validity is the degree to which the finding is interpreted in a correct way" (Kirk and Miller, 1986, p.20) and in CA researches, any claims cannot be made "beyond what is demonstrated by the interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective and hence the whole validity of the enterprise" (Seedhouse, 2004, p.314).

Peräkylä (2011) also states that "the main procedures of validation of the researchers' analytic claims in all conversation include the analysis of the next speakers' interpretation of the preceding action and deviant case analysis" and validation through consideration of the next utterance is mainly used in CA studies (p. 378). Accordingly, in CA research, bringing evidence to claims is made through the next turn-proof procedure. In other words, interactants display their interpretations in the next turn, and any claims are based on participants' interpretations in these next turns and their orientations to each other's turns. In this

thesis, the validation has been provided through 'next turn' in order to describe the sequential unfolding of reformulation and the learners' orientations to reformulation.

Another important issue is external validity which refers to the generalisability of the findings in that to what extend findings of a research go beyond the scope of its own context. As this will be the first study to investigate the reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction, it is not possible to claim that the findings will bear many commonalities for other multi-party interaction. However, the findings can pave the way for some other researches interested in the phenomenon being investigated (describing the characteristics of reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction) so that this study can contribute to generalisability for the future CA researches.

3.7. Reliability

Kirk and Miller (1986) defines reliability as "the degree to which the finding is independent from any accidental circumstances of the research" (p.20) and the quantity of the transcription, quality of the technical tools and selection of the recordings are key aspects for the reliability in a CA research (Peräkylä, 2004).

For this thesis, 58 hours of audio-recorded data, which was drawn from 174 multi-party discussion tasks, was transcribed to provide a large amount of transcription. It is necessary to state that transcription process was carried out by a team including 5 members named as L2 DISCO under the supervision of Assistant Prof. Dr. Olcay SERT. The recordings were divided equally to group members and they were informed about the process. The team members worked collaboratively and met occasionally in order to provide consistency in transcribing data. The quality of the technical tools varied in terms of the recording devices used by the students, so bad-qualified recordings were not included in the analysis.

Moreover, data sessions also play a crucial role in order to provide reliability for a CA analysis. In these sessions, CA researchers come together to examine the data considering all micro details presented within data, and all share their analysis by providing evidence basing on next-turn-proof-procedure. Two extracts from data were presented in two different data sessions mentioned in Section 3.4. to minimize the subjectivity in the transcription process.

3.8. Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodological aspect of the thesis was detailed. CA was introduced as a research methodology with all reasons to adopt by touching the validity and reliability issues. Data collection and transcription processes were also detailed including ethical issues.

In the following section, 20 extracts from a collection of 84 will be analysed by justifying the many issues discussed in this chapter with respect to transcriptions and data analysis while presenting detailed analyses of the examples of the phenomenon being investigated.

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In this chapter, the most common examples of reformulation will be analysed in terms of how they are sequentially constructed and oriented by L2 learners in the ongoing multi-party L2 interaction. Based on a collection of 84 instances, 20 representative extracts were chosen to describe the phenomenon adopting the principles and theoretical underpinnings of CA.

The extracts will exemplify how reformulation is organized by the learners in the formulation of various actions to maintain mutuality and intersubjectivity, thereby providing the progressivity of interaction. Therefore, the analysis of selected 20 extracts will uncover: (1) how learners index some actions (i.e. display of (dis)agreement, request for or respond to confirmation, turn allocation, display recipiency, turn allocation and topic management) as they demonstrate their understanding; (2) how they utilize reformulations as repair resource when an interactional trouble is signalled (i.e. word search, resorting L1 resources, hesitations, long pauses and elongation etc.), and problematic vocabulary or incorrect grammar use is encountered; (3) what linguistic and interactional resources they resort to realize or index their reformulations; (4) in what ways they show (non) orientation and; (5) the most common next actions that reformulation project (i.e. turn extension, elaboration, turn allocation and speaker change).

Reformulation can be metaphorically described as a mirror that is directed to learners to help them see their modified utterances, and as a bridge between the target-like and non-target like language use. Thus, how learners' reformulations create opportunities for their language learning process will also be focused in the analyses by exploring the characteristics of their reformulation practices, thereby providing some implications for L2 language learning.

In accordance with this aim, the phenomenon will be analysed under two main parts to take attention to various characteristics of reformulation: what a reformulated turn demonstrates, and what happens in the subsequent turns after reformulation is constructed. While 4.1 will present 10 instances of sequential organization of reformulation along with the linguistic and interactional resources learners employ, 4.2. will uncover learners' orientation to reformulation with other 10 extracts. Each

section will be concluded with a summary of the phenomenon discussed referring to each separate sections' foci.

4.1. Sequential Unfolding of Reformulations in Multi-party L2 Interaction

Learners tend to reformulate in order to accomplish various actions in their ongoing interaction. Although there have been various studies on reformulation as a recast (Ellis et al., 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nassaji, 2007; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Panova & Lyster, 2002), one of the corrective feedback types in the SLA literature, it is a new phenomenon waiting to be explored in L2 learner-learner interaction from a CA perspective. As it is mentioned in Chapter 2, Kapellidi (2015) addressed this topic, but she focused on teacher-learner interaction in a classroom setting. She also stressed that reformulation is a neglected issue waiting to be investigated from a CA perspective. Therefore, in this chapter, the aim is to investigate this phenomenon by tracking the evidence of it in moment-by-moment analysis on learners' interaction from their own perspectives.

In what ways reformulation unfolds in multi-party L2 interaction, and in what ways the interlocutors display (non)orientation to reformulations will be explicated. Thus, tracking the sequential unfolding of reformulations using 10 selected extracts, 4.1. will present the most typical actions which learners form by reformulating the prior talk. This section will be divided into two subsections. The first one will examine which actions reformulation perform and the second one will focus on reformulation as a repair resource.

4.1.1. Sequential Organization of Reformulations: Demonstration of Understanding

In this section, the analysis of five extracts will show that learners reformulate to demonstrate their understanding while they index some other actions. In terms of their sequential positions, reformulations can be delivered as a first or second pair part of adjacency pairs when learners request for or respond to confirmation. Also, they unfold as independent TCUs in the second turn delivered right after the previous one to display (dis)agreement. Besides, reformulations are produced as second parts of a triadic sequence to display recipiency and cultivate collaborativeness (Waring, 2002) in their ongoing discussion.

As Schegloff (1992) notes:

In parallel with Schegloff's argument above, most of the extracts below will exemplify how learners employ reformulations to demonstrate understanding as they do some other actions.

Extract 1 presents a typical example in which reformulation is constructed as a second pair part of the request-granting adjacency pair to provide confirmation for understanding check. This group is talking about the language evolution and the foreign words used in their native languages.

Extract 1 01_05_ bektas_konamaz_kacar // language evolution

```
01   EB:   .hh er:: ↑firstly i think that we should stop (0.3) borrowing

02         foreign words into turkish ↑language(0.4).hhh ↑but (0.8) er: there

03         are some words: which we borrowed ↑before so we can't ↑cha- change

04         them .hhh [bu-

05   AK:            [y::eah i agree with your point ela because there are

06         some er::: ↑classic er::: not classic but er::: i couldn't remember

07         the word ↑but we already get used to them you mean ↑that?=

08 → EB:   =yes we get accustomed to that (1.1) a:nd we use them as if they

09         are turkish:: words for example ↑train

10         (0.4)

11   AK:   yes=
```

From line 1 to line 4, EB takes a personal stance on borrowing foreign words into their native language (Turkish) by stating that there are some foreign words already internalised by the society. In line 5, AK takes the turn with an overlap, and she displays her agreement by stretching the first sound of (`[y::eah`), which is followed by an explicit preface (`i agree with your point ece`). In the same line, AK extends her turn with a reason of using non-standard language. In line 6, she engages in a word-search that she publicly displays by means of hesitation markers and she completes repair with a tentative candidate wording (`↑classic`). Preceded by a long hesitation, she initiates a repair initiation by marking the candidate repair (`er::: not classic`) as problematic. Following this, she reports inability to recall the word (`i couldn't remember the word`), which displays

her word-search explicitly. In line 7, she aborts her searching, and with another contrastive marker (↑but), she initiates the first pair part of request and granting adjacency pair to request for confirmation for her understanding. She makes her request more explicit with a questioning intonation and rise in pitch (you mean ↑that?=). In line 8, EB immediately orients to AK's invitation with a turn-initial confirmation token (=yes), and she produces the second pair part of the adjacency pair including modified version of AK's final TCU. In her modification, EB preserves the subject pronoun, but she changes her utterance (get used to) with an alternative (get accustomed to) by omitting the word 'already'. Evidently, her modification does not touch the content of her statement, but it simply concerns the act of uttering. In that way, EB's reformulation not only exposes AK to a different repertoire of the target language but also provides the confirmation to her request. Pausing for (1.1), EB pursues her turn and orients to AK's word search with an alternative wording (we use them as if they are turkish:: words). Therefore, with her reformulation, EB also provides an embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987) by locating the trouble (i.e. word search) that emerged in the previous turn. EB ends her turn with an example (↑train) with a rise at turn-final position in line 9 and it is acknowledged by AK after 0.4 seconds of silence.

It is notable that reformulation provides an alteration in the linguistic form of what has been preceded. The modification in the reformulation draws learners' attentions to a synonymous alternative language item by exposing them to varieties in target language use. With reference to its realization, it is produced in the form of a second part in an adjacency pair with the accompany of a pre-positioned confirmation token.

The following sequence also exemplifies the sequential position of reformulation in adjacent utterances. Even though reformulation constitutes a part of request-granting adjacency pair (the first part), it requests for confirmation rather than being a response to it. Here, a group of three discusses on non-standard language use. Right before this sequence, DI states the reason of using non-standard language as young people's tendency to copycat their peers, and the sequence begins with YT's elaboration on the topic with another reason.

```
01   YT:   but in addition to this situation .hh er: a:s ou:r child↑hood

02         we want to be er ↑different ↓from another person .hh

03   SG:   °huh°

04   YT:   er we don't want to be understand er ou:r erm ↑family

05         ((swallowing)) .hh er: a:nd we are different from our peers .hhh

06         we want to be always cool a:nd we want to choose this ↓languages

07 →DI:    do you (0.5) think er:: ↑young people er: erm ↑that >sorry sorry

08         sor-< i mean er: do you think tha:t er ↑young people ((swallowing))

09         when y- young people use .hh nonstandard forms of language .hh

10         they feel ↑cool?

11   SG:   ↑yes absolutely er: they (0.8) ((lip sound)) they use it just to

12         be er: cool because er:: they think ↑that (.) er: using ↑the (.)

13         old turkish (1.0) .hh er:: using old turkish means er:: er: ↑a-

14         ↑anti mode- anti modernism a:nd they think that .hh this is a:

15         er::: a- ↑antique er: old er:: (0.8) thing ↑a:nd .hh er tu- ↑new

16         turkish generation is er::: er growing and uses so much annoying

17         er: (0.6) words [er::

18   DI:                   [yes

19   SG:   er: erm::::: u- used it in other languages (0.8) a::nd
```

In line 1, YT initiates her turn with a contrastive discourse marker, and she defines another reason as young people's desire to be different from others. Preceding SG's listenership token (°huh°) uttered quietly in line 3, YT extends her turn by listing two more reasons (we don't want to be understand er ou:r erm ↑family, we want to be always cool) between lines 4 to 6. In line 7, DI initiates a request for confirmation that is interrupted by a 0.5-second pause and multiple hesitations. At the final position of her turn, DI reports her trouble explicitly in a fast pace (>sorry sorry sor-<), and she initiates self-repair for clarification by stressing the utterance (i mean) in line 8. Preceded by a short hesitation, DI reforms the first pair part of a question and answer adjacency pair to call for a confirmation by modifying YT's previous statements (we want to be always cool a:nd we want to choose this ↓languages) as (when y- young people use .hh nonstandard forms of language .hh they feel

↑cool?). When carefully examined, DI's reformulation includes two TCUs which are combined with a conjunction and this is also the case in YT's statement. However, DI not only changes the positions of TCUs but also uses an alternative conjunction (`when`). In other words, YT's second TCU becomes the first in DI's reformulation, and the conjunction is positioned at the initial position rather than between the TCUs. Moreover, the adjective 'cool' is used with the copular 'be' in the original statement, but DI produces a main verb combination of the adjective (`feel ↑cool?`). Syntactic modifications are also visible in the reformulation such as changing (<u>this</u> ↓`languages`) to (`nonstandard forms of language`) and the third person plural to a noun phrase (young people). What also merits attention is that a correction is embedded in DI's reformulation. In other words, DI locates the grammatical mistakes caused by the plurality of the word (`languages`) as providing the plurality on the elements of language (`nonstandard forms of language`). It is clear that reformulation affected the order of the TCUs and changed some syntactical elements. However, as it is discussed in the previous extract, all these modifications do not impinge on the content of YT's statement. Additionally, she makes her request more explicit with a pre-positioned preface (`do you think`) and with some interactional resources (i.e. an upward and questioning intonation) employed in her last utterance (↑`cool?`).

DI's request is oriented by SG with a sharply uttered confirmation token (↑`yes`) and with (`absolutely`) in line 11. In the same line, another reformulation is produced as a part of the second pair part of an adjacency pair to respond to the comprehension check by changing the design of sentence structure that is SG responds to DI's confirmation request designed in the form of interrogative sentence structure (`do you think tha:t`) by reshaping it in a declarative form. Another important point is that even though DI reformulates YT's utterance, confirmation to her understanding is provided by the third party with another reformulation. Once the intersubjectivity is preserved among learners with two different reformulations, the flow of interaction is managed with the elaboration on topic by SG from line 12 to 17.

Drawing on these two extracts, it can be concluded that reformulations serve as resources to verify comprehension and to ensure interactants' accurate recipiency

of the prior talk. In such cases, reformulations are constructed as parts of a request-granting adjacency pairs. Besides, the last fragment has shown that it is explicitly realized with a pre-positioned linguistic preface (`do you think`) which is combined with some paralinguistic means such as upward and questioning intonation at the last utterance (↑`cool?`). Once the mutuality is provided, learners go back to their main sequences.

Along with confirmation, learners employ reformulation to index their (dis)agreement. Reformulations act as a preface for further argument to construct an agreement or disagreement, which will be exemplified in the following two extracts. In this fragment, arranged marriage and love marriage are compared in terms of their pros and cons and learners are talking about their preferences.

Extract 3: 01_06_aral_bodurkoyuncu_eken // arranged marriage or love marriage

```
01   UA:   [er: but sorry: i interrupt you a:nd i: told that er: (0.9)love

02         marrige is er:: hh (0.8) a good one ↑but .hhh er:: ↑arranged

03         ↑marriage er::: i- erm::: i think .hh is ↑better than ↑because er::

04         (0.8)↑lo:ve i:s ↓not eternal thing .hh it can be[::

05   BB:                                               [eternal?

06   UA:   eternal er:: it cannot be:: er:: it ↑can be finish

07   BB:   [huh yes

08   UA:   [°er: er:° ↑someday so: er <i: dont think> (1.2)you er:: .hh

09         <always> love that person so: er arranged marriage is: better tha-

10         better than ↓love marriage ↓i think

11         (0.8)

12 → BB:   yes an°d° i have the same opinion with ↑you .hh er lo:ve er:: love

13         ↑has an end but er heh heh if you: if you ↑marry an er sensb-

14         sensible person (0.4) or:: er:m do you understand what i mean?=

15   TE:   =y[eah

16   UA:     [yep
```

In line 1, UA takes the turn with an overlap, and she reports her apologies for interruption. Initiating a new TCU with an additive marker (`a:nd`), she cites her previous statement with a preface (`i: told that`). From line 2 to line 4, she takes her personal stance in favour of arranged marriage and claims that love is not

everlasting. In line 5, BB repeats the utterance (`eternal`) in an overlapped fashion to show her trouble in understanding the meaning of the word 'eternal' so that she initiates the repair. BB's request for clarification for an unknown word positions UA as an expert user, which can be related to asymmetric linguistic positions of these two parties. In line 6, UA signals the upcoming repair initiation by duplicating the word, and she paraphrases the word 'eternal' with a sentence in the explanation part of her turn (`it ↑can be finish`). In line 7, BB responds with a state token (`huh`), which displays a change in the speaker's state of knowledge (Heritage, 1984), and claims her understanding with an acknowledgement token (`yes`) acting as a case closure. Following this, UA signals a possible continuation with a turn-medial discourse marker (`so:`) by stretching the final sound in line 8. From line 8 to line 10, UA elaborates on the topic by emphasizing the superiority of arranged marriage over love marriage. Marking the long pause (0.8) in line 11 as a deadlock in the flow of interaction, BB holds the floor with an agreement token (`yes`) and reports her agreement explicitly (`i have the same opinion with ↑you`) in line 12. Preceded by an in-breath, BB emphasizes her agreement by rephrasing UA's previous two statements: (`eternal`) in line 4 and (`it ↑can be finish`) in line 6 as (`love ↑has an end`).

The significance of this extract is twofold. Firstly, BB's reformulation serves as a syntactic and structural modification of the first utterance with the change of the sentence structure. In other words, UA's utterance (`↑lo:ve i:s ↓not eternal thing`) is a negative statement which is formed with an auxiliary verb and an adjective. In her reformulation, BB transforms this utterance into an affirmative form with a main verb and a noun. Secondly, it functions as a kind of embedded correction for the second utterance (`it ↑can be finish`) which includes a noticeable grammar mistake of the use of copular 'be'. When the sequential position is examined, reformulation is constructed as an independent TCU in the second turn to display an adequate recipiency of what is preceded in order to index an agreement. Thus, it does not create a slot for a confirmation or ratification. Importantly, reformulation is constructed by BB who requests for clarification for an unknown word (line 5). In the forthcoming minutes of interaction, she rephrases this word in a sentence structure to convey the same meaning (line 13). Thus, it can be claimed that BB's reformulation brings evidence for her uptake of a new word. This

case corresponds with van Compernolle's (2010) incidental micro-genetic development which refers to a collaborative construction of a learning object in the course of an interaction. The object of learning is incidentally occurred when a repair is requested for an unknown utterance. The clarification for meaning is followed by learner's uptake of the word, which is evident in her reformulation. The sequence is continued by BB who elaborates on the topic with a hypothetical sentence in line 13. She produces if-clause after a cut-off (`sensb-`) but it is interrupted by a 0.4-second of pause and a hesitation in line 14, which signals her trouble to produce the main clause. Assuming that she cannot convey her intended meaning, she ends her turn with an explicit comprehension check (`do you understand what i mean?=`) which is immediately ensured with an acknowledgement token by TE in line 15 and with a colloquial expression (`[yep`) by UA in line 16.

In contrast to the previous extract, the sequence below will exemplify how reformulation is constructed to index disagreement by paraphrasing the prior talk. The topic is overconsumption and four students are talking about the reasons. At the very beginning of this sequence, HA claims that overconsumption is caused by people's desire to buy new products, which leads to overproduction.

Extract 4: 02_3_latif_demiraga_asarli_acar // consumption

```
01   EL    ye:s it's true that factories today: produce more than we ↑need

02         and unfortunately most of these products go to rubbish bins (0.9)

03         so er (0.8) er: i am: afraid i don't agree at that point cause

04         er: i think it's the: behavior of people that affects er: each

05         other and er consume too much.

06         (0.6)

07  →HA    you say er: the: (0.6) the: (0.7) items that was producted much er:

08         are ↑being (0.8) are throwed rubbish. (0.6) i don't think ↓so

09         cause:(0.8) so many peo↑ple: want to: er ↑buy it and er: <if they:

10         didn't buy it>er: they: (0.8) they would stop it's (0.7) pro- er

11         it's pro- (1.7) they'll ↑stop er to produce it.

12         (1.1)

13   EL    yes: there are: some people that er uses (.) wasted er: foods or

14         wasted (0.7) er: bottles, plastic bottles er: to create new things

15         like and decorative thing you are true at that point=
```

In line 1, EL agrees with HA that factories produce much more than needed and most of these products are wasted. Preceded by long pauses and hesitations, EL mitigates her disagreement with a formulaic statement (`i am: afraid`) in line 3 by claiming that people's behaviours influence overconsumption.

Referring to EL's previous turn with a preface (`you say`) in line 7, HA initiates a new TCU which is interrupted by a pause (0.6) and the repetition of the definite article (`the:`) by stretching the final sound. After a 0.7 second of silence in line 7, HA restates EL's statement (`most of these products go to rubbish bins`) with some modification in its structural and syntactical form (`items that was producted much er: are ↑being (0.8) are throwed rubbish`). He transforms sentence structure into a passive form and defines the subject with a relative clause. Modification is also made in syntactical elements of sentence such as altering the verb, quantifier, and the subject (`these products → item, go → throw`). Evidently, HA's reformulation provides more sophisticated langue use for the other parties. It is noteworthy that even though these statements include grammatical mistakes, they 'let them pass' (Firth,1996) as they do not constitute any trouble for mutual understanding. Following this, HA pauses for 0.6 seconds and displays an explicit disagreement (`i don't think ↓so`). From line 9 to 11, he explains the reason of his disagreeing with a hypothetical utterance (`if they: didn't buy it>er: they: (0.8) they would stop`) by claiming that people are responsible for the overproduction but not the factories. Between these lines, even though he displays trouble with multiple long pauses and cut-offs, he does not initiate any request for help nor do other learners. After a quiet long pause (1.1) in line 12, EL holds the floor with an acknowledgement token and elaborates on the topic. She states that not all products are wasted, but they are used by some people for decorative purposes. In line 15, she displays a change in her personal stance by agreeing with HA. As for sequential positions, these two sequences demonstrate that reformulations are not produced as a part of adjacent utterances rather they unfold as independent TCUs in the following turns acting as prefaces for argumentative talks.

Mondana (2011) gives a story completion as example of "understanding positions" (Sacks,1992, p.426) which refers to specific sequential environments within a talk

for 'doing understanding'. According to Mondana, using a proverbial expression can exhibit recipients' possible understanding. The following extract will be an example of such a case in which reformulation is produced in the form of a saying to demonstrate understanding. In other words, reformulation is employed to display a sense of humour, which is also made clear with laughter. This excerpt is another part of the discussion given in Extract 1 and three students are talking about some specific words invented with the advent of internet. The sequence starts with one of the learners reminding others some animations they used in a chat programme.

Extract 5: 01_05_ bektas_konamaz_hacar// language evolution part 2

```
01   AK:  er::: and i remember the guy er:: who is er: ↑BReak↓ing his er

02        guitar

03        (1.1)

04   EB:  °ye::s°

05   AK:  remember that?

06   AH:   yes er:[::

07   EB:         [of course and the sun (0.7) f::lowers a:nd, ((AK laughs))

08   AK:  yes something like that

09   AH:  there is an old days but gold ↑↑DAys. ((all laugh))

10 → AK:  $you say oldie but goldie$

11   AH:  y:- [>yes yes yes<

12   AK:      [okay

13   AH:  SO the second question is like that.
```

Initiating her turn with an elongated hesitation marker in line 1, AK refers to an old chat programme event which he presumes to be used by her friends. After a very long pause (1.1) in line 3, EB shows orientation to the example with a stretched acknowledgement token (°ye::s°) uttered in a noticeably quiet manner. In line 5, AK forms the first pair part of the adjacency pair to check others' recognition (You, 2015) and to elicit a confirmation from others (remember that?). In line 6, AH displays his shared background with a confirmation token, and he signals his continuation with a long hesitation (er:[::). Another confirmation is provided by EB ([of course) in an overlapped fashion and a common background for the rest of the sequence is ensured collaboratively. In line 7, EB steps up her recognition

with another example (`the sun (0.7) f::lowers`) and marks a continuation by stretching the final sound of the conjunction (`a:nd`). However, EB's continuation is stopped by AK's laughter which is followed by her confirmation in line 7. Following this, in line 9, AH expresses a kind of yearning to past years with an emphasis on the word (`gold`) and strong upward intonation at the onset of the last utterance (`↑↑Days`), which triggers laughter. In line 10, AK echoes AH's utterance with a smiley voice (`$you say oldie but goldie$`) in that she reformulates AH's turn by using a formulaic language with a pre-positioned linguistic resource (`you say`) which makes the reformulation more explicit. Besides, she combines it with laughter to point to something laughable (Sert & Jacknick, 2015). By doing so, AK signals that her reformulation will be a simple echo of previous talk rather than a new formulation. AK's reformulation acts as a display of recipiency and cultivating collabortiveness in their discussion (Waring, 2002). Her reformulation is confirmed by AH in an overlapped fashion with consecutive confirmation tokens uttered in a fast pace (`[>yes yes yes<`) in line 11. In line 12, AK signals a sequence closing with a confirmation token (`[okay`), which is oriented by AH's subsequent turn acting as a case closer. In contrast to the previous extracts, reformulation unfolds neither as an adjacent utterance nor an independent TCU. It constitutes as a part of a triadic sequence which is followed by a sequence closing.

All in all, the analysis thus far has unrevealed three different sequential positions even though they all serve as demonstration of understanding. While they occur as parts of adjacent utterance in term of confirmation check, they are formed as independent TCUs in the form of a preface for an argumentative talk. Also, the last excerpt has illustrated a different sequential position; namely triadic sequence, in which reformulation occurs in the second position. This sequential type will be encountered in all sequences in which reformulations are employed as repair resources. To this end, its employment as a repair initiator will be analysed in the following section with 5 extracts.

4.1.2. Sequential Organization of Reformulations as Other-Repair and Other-Correction

Repair is an inevitable part of conversation to maintain mutual understanding and progressivity in an ongoing interaction. Interactants employ different kinds of repair, all of which were explained in Chapter 2. While repair can be for a single linguistic

item, it can also include many problematic turns. As Hosoda (2006) puts forward, "instances of repair can be found when there is no apparent error (e.g. word searches)" (p.27). In line with this, the following extract will exemplify how reformulation is constructed as a repair resource to verify comprehension with a better-structured and organized modification. In this extract, a group of four is talking about a regulation (dress code) in schools and its effects on students' academic success.

Extract 6 02_1_alkan_basatan_hayran_colakhan// dress code

```
01  MB:   er i think even if we er we are wearing a uniform in primary

02        school when er when we e- we enter the we enter the univer↑sity

03        we finally (1.8) er final- finally don't wear uniform (1.3) it's

04        not case

05        (1.0)

06  GA:   okay my friends i'm gonna to- think about it later

07        (2.2)

08  MC:   yes (1.2) er so we do we all agree that there shouldn't be a

09        dresscode for students °or not°

10  GA:   students i'm not sure er teachers shouldn't be a dresscode

11  MC:   for students?

12  GA:   er should be

13 →MC:   so you say there shouldn't be for ↑teachers but there should be

14        for students

15  GA:   yes

16  MC:   and what is your: er opinion on that
```

In line 1, MB initiates her turn by taking a personal stance, and she compares her primary school and university life in terms of wearing a school uniform. Even though long pauses and cut-offs display her trouble, she self-repairs and completes her turn. After a very long silence (1.1), GA takes the turn to report that she will make a delayed contribution to the topic and she gives the turn opportunity to other learners, which is non-oriented by the others for a long time (2.2). Following this, MC takes the turn with an affirmative particle (yes), and she pauses for 1.2 seconds in line 8. Preceded by a short hesitation in the same line, she initiates a new TCU

with a discourse marker (so) to request for confirmation for their agreement on revoking the dress code regulation for students in schools. In line 10, GA expresses her uncertainty for students, but she highlights the necessity of cancelation for teachers. Apparently, GA's turn does not reflect a target-like form considering the structural and syntactic formulation of her TCUs. In line 11, MC initiates the first pair part of the adjacency pair for a clarification request with regard to students' case. In the subsequent line, GA clarifies the necessity of dress code for students. Being adequately sure, in line 13, MC initiates a turn with a discourse marker to mark what comes next as a reformulation (Hauser, 2006). Following this, she edits GA's two separate turns to verify her understanding. The modifications in her reformulation include better structured utterances by redeveloping the linguistic features of GA's turns, and that makes the gist of the previous utterances much clearer. Additionally, this linguistic modification also acts as an embedded correction for incorrect language use in terms of syntactical and structural aspects, which is oriented by a confirmation token uttered by GA in line 15.

Drawing upon this example, it can be claimed that reformulation is a kind of mirror directed to others to reflect a target-like language use of their non-target-like utterances. It can be argued that MC's reformulation is not produced to request for confirmation, rather it is organized to demonstrate her understanding and to rebroadcast GA's utterance for the benefit of the others. After GA's confirmation, MC positions herself as a moderator and allocate the turn to another student in line 16.

As mentioned in previous section, reformulations unfold in the second turn of a triadic sequence when they are deployed as repair resources and this extract exemplifies the case. Put otherwise, a prior talk is reformulated in the second turn and it is followed by a confirmation in the third turn to repair a trouble encountered in the flow of interaction. Additionally, the linguistic resources employed in these two extracts are the same in terms of their functions (making reformulation explicit) and positions (pre-positioned) in the given turns.

Word search has attracted many scholars' attention who adopt CA as a research methodology (e.g. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003; Lerner, 1996). Reichert and Liebscher (2012) define word search "as a kind of repair which has two parts: initiation and outcome" (p.600). Accordingly, the following two extracts

will demonstrate how learners employ reformulation to repair a word search when it is signalled by cut-off, and repetitions (Lerner, 1996), hesitations or with an embodiment action. This joint search will also demonstrate their admitting their novice and expert roles in the interaction, which comes from a discussion about the age difference between married couples, and the sequence below is initiated by EK who elaborates on the topic with an example.

Extract 7: 01_06_kor-talipoglu-samanci// age difference in marriage

```
01   EK:  er: and er: ↑they think er s::ame they er: have same (.)

02        expectations they .hh er think (.) same er:::m

03        (2.7)

04 → KT:  like minded

05   EK:  like minded [↓yes]

06   KT:              [↓yes]

07   MS:  °yes° and also my er:: grandmother and my grandfather .hh er:

08        have a age difference in their relationship, er ↑my grandfather

09        is: older than my grandmother: er::m: .hhh exactly ↑maybe

10        fifteen.
```

EK starts her turn with a hesitation marker and from line 1 to line 2, she states that her parents have similar thoughts and expectations despite their age differences. In line 1, she elongates the first sound of the utterance (`s::ame`) and she initiates a new TCU including a short hesitation and a micro pause. In line 2, she duplicates her first utterance (`↑they think er s::ame`) with an in-breath and a short hesitation, then she ends her turn with an elongated hesitation marker. It is evident that EK invites others to find an appropriate utterance with her elongations, hesitations, and repetition. By doing so, she positions others as expert language users by signalling the lexical gap in her linguistic repertoire. Considering the long pause (2.7) in line 3, neither MS nor KT orients to repair initiation. Instead, they show their preference for EK's self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). This is also called as 'getting it right' by Schegloff (1997) which refers to displaying non-orientation to repair invitation and giving the floor to the learner to initiate or do self-repair. However, realising EK's non-orientation to self-repair, KT provides a candidate utterance (`like minded`) in line 4, thus positioning herself an expert language

user. EK's subsequent repetition of the candidate phrase and a turn-final acknowledgement token are the evidence of her acceptance and her orientation both to her novice role and to EK's expert status. In line 6, KT confirms EK's uptake of the candidate word, which also shows her orientation to her expert role. KT's confirmation token with a fall in pitch not only evaluates EK's uptake but also acts as repair completion and a case closer. MS' elaboration on the topic with her grandparents' age difference between lines 7 and 10 provides a further evidence to KT's case closing as well as to her expert role.

Extract 8 below will also illustrate a word search sequence and the employment of a reformulation within this sequence. It is also similar to Extract 7 in terms of learners' employment of 'getting it right' (Schegloff, 1997) strategy. But, in contrast to the previous one, learners pass up the repair invitation with a response token rather than a long silence. Moreover, the learner invites help more explicitly with an embodied action together with her perturbation (i.e. hesitations and elongation). The function of reformulation is also different because it does not provide a candidate utterance to refer to different TCUs rather it functions as an embedded correction for a problematic lexis which is offered as a candidate solution to the word search. In this extract, learners are discussing on freedom and equality of people and they address the topic to a more specific context by giving Korean people as an example.

Extract 8 02_6_ural_efirli_elek // freedom and equality of people

```
01   ME:  yes er:(1.6) er:: they er: classify people er: three categorize↑

02   SE:  huh huh

03   ME:  categorizes an:d er: (.) first one is er: the people who are er:

04        not a (.) er: (.) er: ((snapping finger))

05   SE:  huh [huh

06   ME:      [who are er: pure korean (.) people=

07   SE:  =hu:h=

08   SU:  =hu:h

09   ME:  .hh a[:nd er:

10   SU:       [pure Korean

11   ME:  or

12→  SE:  native korean
```

```
13   ME:  ye:s native korean .hh and er: (.) er:: (2.0)

14        ((snapping finger))

15   SE:  okay i[f you don't

16   ME:         [eylem neydi

17   SE:  huh↑

18   ME:  .hh hmn:

19   SE:  demonstrator↑
```

In line 1 and 2, ME states that North Korean people are classified in three categories by their government, which is followed by SE's listenership token (`huh huh`). In line 3, ME self-repairs her utterance (`categorize`) which does not include the plural suffix 's'. Following this, ME signals a continuation stretching the first sound of additive discourse marker (`an:d`) which is followed by a short hesitation and micro pause. In the same line, she initiates a new TCU to define the first category, but she produces disfluencies (i.e. hesitations and micro pauses) and initiates a repair with an embodied request by snapping her finger. In line 5, SE utters a go-ahead token (`huh [huh`), which shows her non-orientation to ME's help request. By doing so, she creates an opportunity for ME to self-repair and ME orients to the 'getting it right' by providing a candidate utterance which she defines with a relative clause (`[who are er: pure korean (.) people=`). It is evident that SE's passing up the chance to repair serves the purpose. ME's self-repair is immediately acknowledged by SE in line 7 and by SU in line 8. Preceded by an in-breath, ME initiates a new TCU in line 9, but her turn is overlapped by SU with the repetition of ME's utterance (`[pure korean`). In line 11, ME marks a possible continuation with a discourse marker (`or`) which is followed by SE's alternative utterance (`native Korean`). SE's reformulation functions as an embedded correction with the modification in the adjective (pure→ native) to produce a target-like expression so that she displays her epistemic authority and puts herself into an expert position. In other words, she assumes an expert status by correcting a non-target like utterance which is oriented by ME in line 13. ME's stretched acknowledgement token (`ye:s`) and her repetition of the repaired word not only shows her uptake but also displays her orientation to her novice status. Interestingly, reformulation is not produced right after the first emergence of the problematic utterance, rather it is delayed until another learner takes it up. Thus, it can be argued that when a problematic utterance, which has

been passed over in the first occurrence, is taken up by a learner, reformulation is employed to prevent learners' uptakes of non-target like utterance. Orienting to the repair, ME goes back to the main sequence but she displays another trouble in line 13 and she solicits helps with the same embodiment resource (line 14) after a very long pause. In line 15, SE takes the turn, but her initiation is overlapped by ME who explicitly request help for a word by deploying her bilingual resources via code switching in line 16. In line 17, SE utters a response token to show her awareness and in line 18, ME displays her 'doing thinking' with (`.hh hmn:`) (Brouwer, 2003). In line 19, SE provides a candidate wording (`demonstrator↑`) with an upward intonation.

As it is shown, learners resort to their L1 resources to solicit help from other learners. Learners can switch to their L1 to get an immediate help for a word searched and it is oriented with a target language equivalent as it is the case in the previous extract. The following extract will also exemplify a sequence in which L1 is resorted as a resource, and how reformulation is deployed to provide a target-like equivalent for an L1 utterance. In this extract, a group of three are discussing on whether giving English names to shops or companies should be banned or not. They also mention some invented names for cafes, and AH exemplifies the case with an example in their own campus**.**

Extract 9: 01_05_ bektas_konamaz_hacar//language evolution

```
01  AH: in our campus you know(.) the ↑haluks

02  AK:   °evet°

03  AH:   ↓and keops .hhh i supported the keops because er:: there is an er::

04        foreign (↑lin) but used er their standart /ˈstandəd/ form=

05 →AK:   =yes it's origi↑nal [form

06  AH:                       [OR-ORIGINAL >yes original ↓one< when we look

07        at the ↑haluk's that mean belongs to HALUK

08  AK:   yes=

09  AH:   =abi but i think there is an er:::m (1.3) <clich:e> or: hhh (0.2)
```

In line 1, AH narrows the scope to a specific context (`in our campus`), and he refers to their epistemic domains (you know), which is an act of claiming shared knowledge. He gives the name of the cafe (`↑haluk's`) as an example with a rising intonation on the onset of the word, which is followed by AK's confirmation by switching to Turkish (`°evet°`). In line 3, AH gives another example (`keops`) and states his favour for it claiming that it is an original name, which is free from any modifications. In line 4, AH uses the Turkish equivalent of a foreign word (`standart`), an adaptation of the English word 'standard', to mention the name's originality. Even though AH resorts to his L1 resource, his word choice is not compatible with his intended meaning. Latching AH's turn with an acknowledgement token, AK modifies AH's utterance (`standart`) with an alternative wording (`origi↑nal`) in line 5. By doing so, she not only provides a repair but also reminds the target-language-only rule, which is an act of language policing (Amir and Musk 2013). Overlapping AK's final utterance, AH repeats the proffered utterance loudly, which marks his acceptance of 'original' provided by AK as a solution in line 6. In the same line, he orients to the repair with an acknowledgement token (`yes`), and combines the reformulated utterance with a pronoun (`original  ↓one`). That shows AH's orientation to both the repair and the language policing. Following this, he extends his turn and takes attention to the other example (`↑haluks`) with a sharp pitch on the onset off the utterance in line 7. He pursues his turn by explaining the function of possessive 's' and utters the word loudly by putting a stress on it to draw others' attention to the utterance at turn-final position in line 7. Latching AK's confirmation token, AH continues his explanation with a Turkish equivalent of 'brother' (`abi`) in line 9. Preceded by a contrastive marker, AH takes a personal stance, but he displays a trouble with a long hesitation. After a long pause, he self-repairs and utters a candidate word (`<clich:e>`). However, with an elongated discourse marker (`or:`), out-breath and a pause (Schegloff et al., 1977) he signals his word search, which is also followed by an explicit word search marker (`how can i say`) (Brouwer, 2003) in line 10.

Extract 10 also demonstrates how reformulation is deployed as an embedded correction for an incorrect grammar use with the help of an interactional resource.

The excerpt comes from the very beginning of the interaction in which a group of four are discussing about motivation. Right before this sequence, one of them shifts the topic to how to increase the motivation, and then MS takes the floor to elaborate on the topic.

Extract 10 1_3_kor_talipoglu_samanci// motivation

```
01   MS:  if we er: talk about to increase motivation for a person er: we

02        can er: say different things er: for example i er: think that

03        first of all er: one must identify er:: her one er:: his himself

04        or herself goal being as specific as possible determining a goal

05        (1.2) [in our life]

06   KT:        [hmm: yes]

07   EK:  goal is the er important thing as you said because erm: (0.8)

08        when a person have a goal or erm want to success some want to

09        er:: (1.2) erm achieved (0.2)

10 → KT:  achieve?

11   EK:  achieve something erm: (1.2) he or she want to er:

12        (1.3)

13   KT:  handle?

14        (0.7)

15   EK:  yes handle or er: go to this way.
```

Between the lines 1 and 5, MS takes a personal stance on the necessity of setting specific goals to increase motivation. After a 1.2 second of silence, MS completes her turn in line 5. KT shows orientation to MS's assertion with a response (`hmm:`) and acknowledgement token with an overlapped fashion. In line 7, EK displays agreement on the importance of setting goal by referring to what is preceded with a backward preface (`as you said`). In the same line, she initiates a reason with a conjunction 'because', which is interrupted by a short hesitation and 0.8 seconds of silence at turn-final position. In line 8, she initiates a conditional clause (`when a person have a goal`), and she reshapes her clause with a syntactic alteration (`want to success`). She solicits help by signalling her word search with the repetition of the utterance 'want to' in line 8, and the turn initial hesitation marker in

55

line 9. After a 1.2 second of pause and turn-medial hesitation, she self-repairs with a candidate utterance in the past participle (`achieved`) which is grammatically inaccurate. In line 10, KT modifies the candidate utterance by deleting morpheme 'd'. At the same time, she uses her accentuation (i.e. questioning intonation) to draw EK's attention to the change in the utterance, which eases the corrective effect of reformulation by acting as a try-marking (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). In line 11, EK shows alignment by taking the proffered grammatical item up and using it in a larger unit (with an indefinite pronoun). Importantly, even though the modification is minimal in KT's reformulation, it displays more than a simple correction. In other words, KT does not orient to herself as an expert who provides an explicit correction. Rather, she employs an interactional resource (i.e. questioning intonation) to draw EK's attention to the modification, thereby drawing her attention to the mistake she previously did. Accordingly, KT invites a collaborative repair rather than other-repair. Following this, EK takes the word up and goes back to the main sequence in line 11. In the same line, she signals a possible continuation with a turn-medial hesitation marker. After a 1.2 second of silence, EK pursues her turn by initiating a new TCU, which is interrupted by a short hesitation in line 11 and a long pause (`1.3`) in line 12. Realising EK's word search through her perturbations, KT offers a candidate utterance (`handle?`) and with questioning intonation, she displays her candidate utterance is try-marked. In other words, she displays her doubt about the appropriateness of her candidate utterance. However, there is a delayed orientation to it by EK who takes the word up in line 15.

Thus, it could be cogently argued that reformulations of this sort aim primarily at preventing learners from taking a problematic utterance (Extract 8) or drawing attention to incorrect grammar use as it has been discussed in Extract 10.

4.1.3. Summary of the Section

Learners' practices of reformulation have been investigated within 10 extracts to explore the characteristics of reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction, and they will be briefly summarized in this section. The general findings of the Section 4.1.1. and 4.1.2. have been summarized in Table 1 and Table 2 below:

Table 1: Reformulation as Demonstration of Understanding

	Action	*Sequence*	*Next action*	*Interactional Resources*	*Linguistic Resources*
Extract 1	Providing confirmation	Second pair part of the adjacency pair	Elaboration in the same turn		Confirmation token (yes)
Extract 2	Request for confirmation	First pair part of the adjacency pair	Confirmation from the third-party (speaker change)	Rising and questioning intonation	A preface (do you think)
Extract 3	Display agreement	Independent TCU	Elaboration in the same turn	Preceded by 0.8 seconds of silence	Agreement phrase (I have the same opinion with you)
Extract 4	Display disagreement	Independent TCU	Elaboration in the same turn	Preceded by 0.6 seconds of silence	Preface (you say) Disagreement phrase (I don't think so)
Extract 5	Displaying substantive recipiency	Triadic sequence	Sequence closing	Laughter	Preface (you say)

Table 2: Reformulation as Other-Repair and Other-Correction

	Action	*Sequence*	*Next action*	*Interactional Resources*	*Linguistic Resources*
Extract 6	Other-repair (re-developing the gist of the previous talk)	Triadic sequence	Sequence closing and turn allocation		Preface (so you say)
Extract 7	Other-repair (word search)	Triadic sequence	Orientation (yes+repetition) (speaker change)	Preceded by 2.7 seconds of silence	
Extract 8	Other correction (problematic vocabulary use)	Triadic sequence	Orientation (yes+repetition) go back to main sequence		
Extract 9	Other-repair (code-mixed utterance)	Triadic sequence	Orientation (repetition+yes) go back to main sequence		Acknowledge ment token (yes)
Extract 10	Other correction (grammar mistake)	Triadic sequence	Orientation (repetition) go back to main sequence	Questioning intonation	

To start with, learners tend to reformulate to request or provide confirmation, to display (dis)agreement and to initiate a repair as they demonstrate their understanding. With reference to its sequential format, reformulations can be constructed both as adjacency pairs or independent TCUs in the second turn. In an adjacency pair, they can form the first or the second part (Extracts 1 and 2) to ask for or provide confirmation. When they are not a part of an adjacency pair, they follow what is preceded (Extracts 3 and 4). Table 1 above illustrates the general findings of the first five extracts. However, the most typical sequential unfolding of reformulation is a triadic sequence which constitutes an utterance in the first turn, reformulation in the second and confirmation in the third turn. (Extracts 5, 6,7,8, 9 and 10). The analysis has also revealed that learners resort some linguistic and interactional resources, of which the most commons are "you say" and "yes, yeah". They use 'you say' to refer to what is preceded and to realize their reformulation more explicitly. 'Yeah and yes' are utilized to show orientation to what has been previously uttered by providing confirmation or ratification. Additionally, there are some others such as "do you think" and "I have the same opinion with you" to index agreement and disagreement. It is noteworthy that all these resources are employed in either pre-positioned or post positioned form. It can be claimed that learners deploy these resources as a bridge between what is preceded and what will be reformulated by bringing evidence for their understanding. As for interactional resources, rising intonation, laughter and questioning intonation are frequently resorted by learners.

Importantly, most of the reformulation is followed by an extension or an elaboration on the topic, and they are initiated either in the same turn with reformulation or in the subsequent turns by other learners. However, in Extracts 5 and 6, they project case closure. Yet, it is followed by a topic shift in the former and by a turn allocation in the latter. What is more, when reformulation is employed as a repair resource the learner, who displays trouble, is given the chance to go back to his/her main sequence.

As for the language learning, the analysis thus far, has demonstrated how learners create learning opportunities through reformulation. They co-constructed a learning object (Extract 3), provided more sophisticated language use (Extract 4), prevented the uptake of a non-target like utterance (Extract 8) and helped learners realize their

mistakes (Extract 10). Moreover, they rebroadcast an ambiguous turn for the benefit of others by making the meaning clear (Extract 6). Therefore, they ensure mutuality and intersubjectivity for the sake of their interaction.

4.2. Learners' (Non)Orientations to Reformulations

The analysis in the previous section has a more descriptive role in order to discover the features of reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction. It has revealed how reformulation create learning opportunities as well as enabling learners to ensure mutual understanding, thereby maintaining intersubjectivity.

This section will be a further step to explore more about learners' reformulations by putting their (non)orientations under the microscope. To do this, 10 extracts are involved in this section and analysed in order to explore whether learners display orientations to reformulations and the actions performed through them. The analysis will demonstrate that reformulation is generally followed by learners' orientations and most of them are produced in an overlapped fashion in the subsequent turn. However, the actions which reformulation forms, may also have an effect on learners' display of orientations. What is more, the ways they orient to reformulations also vary in terms of the linguistic resources employed.

The following two extracts will illustrate how reformulations function as embedded repair as they perform some other actions (i.e. alignment and agreement) They are followed by other parties' orientations to the actions performed rather than the corrective function of reformulations. This excerpt comes from the first minutes of a discussion beginning with a learner's self-introduction and management of the topic.

Extract 11 1_3_aser_burma_ozkurt // cultures

```
01   MO:  hello er: i am melda. today we are going to talk about culture.
02        (0.7) er:: (1.0) guys, er:: what does a-what does culture mean
03        for you? for example what's the definition of it? or er: does it
04        have a (.) definition?
```

```
05        (0.4)

06   MA:  i think we can't define er: a culture er:: strictly.

07        (0.4)

08   KB:  [ye::s]

09   MA:  [maybe](0.3)yes=

10   KB:  =but we er:: can say their types (0.4) the culture's types

11        [for example]

12   MA:  [maybe what] er:: does tha-it includes

13 → MO:   yeah what does it consist of maybe.

14        (1.0)

15   MA:  for example it can be: language.
```

Between lines 1 and 4, MO initiates the first pair part of question-answer adjacency pair, and directs a couple of questions about whether they can define culture or not, and what culture means for them. Preceding 0.4 seconds of silence, MA produces the second pair part of the adjacency pair by taking a personal stance in line 6 which is followed by MA's agreement with a stretched agreement token (`[ye::s]`). MA takes the turn back with an overlapped possibility marker in line 9. Preceded by a 0.3-second of silence, she continues with an affirmative particle (`yes=`), which is latched by KB for an invitation to elaborate on the topic. With an overlap, MA shows orientation with a candidate utterance (`[maybe what] er:: does tha-it includes`). Apparently, her utterance includes an accurate form with a third person singular suffix 's' in an interrogative sentence structure. In line 13, MO ratifies this new topic and shows her alignment (see Dings, 2014) with a reformulation of the MA's candidate utterance. At first glance, MO's reformulation can seem like a repetition of the prior turn. Yet, it functions as an embedded repair for a grammatical mistake of third person singular suffix 's' with an alternative wording (`consist`) used in accordance with the interrogative sentence structure.

It can be cogently argued that the significance of MO's reformulation is threefold. Firstly, it provides an alternative wording to convey the same meaning (consist). Secondly, it acts as an embedded correction by providing a target-like interrogative sentence structure. However, it is necessary to state that the utterance (`[maybe what] er:: does tha-it includes`) is a noun clause rather than an

interrogative form. Therefore, even though MO's reformulation offers a correction for the grammatical mistake, it is also inaccurate when the statement is considered as a noun clause. Yet, this may not be accepted as a mistake assuming that MO regards it as an interrogative. Preceded by a long pause (`1.0`), MA's elaboration on topic with an example can be given as the evidence of her orientation to MO's alignment displayed through reformulation. On the other hand, no orientation is displayed to the corrective function of reformulation, which can be explained by that inaccurate grammar form does not threaten the mutuality among these parties. Thus, MA prefers going back to her main sequence to extend her turn in line 15.

A similar case is also exemplified in Extract 12 below with a small difference. In contrast to the previous example, an interactional resource (i.e. an emphasis) is employed by the learner to draw attention to the corrective function of reformulation. Similarly, no orientation is displayed to the correction by the learner as mutuality is ensured through the reformulation. In this extract, the dress code and its effect on the students' academic success are discussed by three learners, but the sequence will demonstrate an instance of two learners' dialogue.

Extract 12 03_02_manolya_keser_tufan// dresscode

```
01   MM:  er:: in my opinion the way the (.) teacher er:: dressing doesn't

02        matter. for example .hh if a student er: a good student er:: he or

03        she come to school he just want to: to learn something .hh but the

04        way the teacher er:: dressing >are not< going to: let er: him .hh

05        don't (.) learn ju-just say. but he have to: know .hh okay i just

06        come to study this is my-my priority it's not (.) looking at the

07        way the teacher dressing °something like that°

08 →  EK:  .hh yes, he has to know that but (.) >what if< he doesn't ↑kno:w

09        (1.4)

10   MM: >but it's depend on <wh-which er: (1.4) students are talking about

11        are we talking about high school students↓ o:r ↑primary school

12        students
```

The sequence starts with MM's long turn in which she expresses her personal stance on the effects of teachers' clothes on students' academic success between

lines 1 to 7. Marking MM's last utterance (°`something like that`°) which is quietly uttered as a turn completion, EK initiates a turn with an audible inhale in line 8. This is followed by her explicit orientation with an agreement token and one of the MM's previous utterances. Evidently, this is not a complete duplication of what is preceded, rather it is a reformulation of MM's utterance with a change in the modal auxiliary (`has to`). Apparently, EK produces reformulation to align with what MM previously said and the emphasis on the modal verb is most likely resorted to attach MM's attention to her mistake. Once she orients to MM's argument in line 8, she directs the topic to a probable opposite case by forming the first pair part of the question-answer adjacency pair with a hypothetical question (`>what if< he doesn't ↑kno:w`). This was followed by a very long pause (`1.4`) in line 9, and MM's formulation of the second pair part of the adjacency pair to mention a specific age group of students from lines 10 to 12.

Drawing upon the last two extracts above, reformulations are not followed by explicit orientations in the subsequent turns as it will be the case in the following extracts. However, that does not mean that learners do not display orientations to reformulations. Rather, their elaborations on the topic in the following turns can be given as the evidence for their orientations to the actions reformulations serve. On the other hand, it is evident that they do not orient to the corrective functions of reformulations. This is likely that the grammatical mistakes do not blur the intended meaning and learners may prefer passing them away.

In contrast to the previous extracts, the extract below exemplifies a delayed orientation to the corrective function of reformulation. In this fragment, four students are talking about the effects of children peers on their education.

Extract 13 4_atar_cem_akyar_duduoglu//child education

```
01   EA:  er: yes friends are effective er:   on <children education>.hh er:

02        for example friends have bad addictions (.) and (0.7) children

03        (.) are effected negatively

04   EC:  .hh yes BUT i think they may h- er: have positive effects (.) on

05        their friends' life

06   FD:  yes i think so and er: for example er: hard working students can
```

```
07          encourage their f-friends

08   BA:    .hh yes you are right .hh er:: but er: children who: smoke .hh a-

09          are affect effective er:

10   X:     [(

11   BA     [(children e/d/ucation negative way .hh or er:: children .hh who

12          swore err:=

13 → X:     =swear

14          (2.8)

15   BA:    swear always .hh er: effect(s) er: their children

16   X:     their friends=

17   BA:    =their friends' e/d/ucation

18   EA:    ye:s both of you: are right er: to some extend .hh er: yes hmn:

19          friends have er: both (.) positive and negative effects .hh but

20          positive (.) effects er: more than negative effects i- i think

21          a:nd
```

From line 1 and 3, EA elaborates on the topic and states that children can affect their peers and their education. In line 4, preceded by an in-breath, EC firstly aligns with EA, and then she takes an opposite stance which is marked with a loudly-uttered contrastive discourse marker (BUT). In line 6, FD displays her agreement, and she elaborates on the topic with a declarative assertion (hard working students can encourage their f-friends). In line 8, BA responds with an explicit agreement (you are right) and she marks her possible continuation with a turn-medial in-breath and hesitations. Following this, she initiates a new TCU including a self-repair in line 9 (are affect effective) and signals her expansion with the turn-final hesitation marker, which is also clear in the overlap (between lines 10 and 11) to hold the floor. In line 11, she pursues her turn and her final TCU is a relative clause including a past participle (swore) in line 12. In this line, too, BA displays her continuation with an elongated hesitation marker, which is non-oriented by X (undefinable learner) in a latching fashion to initiate an embedded correction. In line 13, X transforms BA's utterance (swore) into a present form (swear) which is followed by a long hesitation in line 14. The significance of this

long pause is twofold. Firstly, it can be regarded as 'doing thinking' (Brouwer, 2003) to realize the (mis)matching between her utterance and the reformulation. Secondly, it can also be argued that with this long pause, BA challenges X's expert position, which is displayed with a reformulation. However, BA repeats the modified utterance and shows orientation to it by pursuing her turn in line 15. Importantly, the second reformulation is also produced in line 16 by the same learner (X) to repair a problematic vocabulary. In other words, X modifies BA's utterance (`their children`) as (`their friends`), with alteration of noun. Interestingly, the second reformulation is immediately oriented by BA with an uptake in the following line. Thus, it can be claimed that BA's immediate acceptance in line 17 brings evidence for the dynamic nature of their orientation to the expert roles displayed through reformulation.

In contrast to the previous extracts, reformulation in this sequence is not deployed with the aim of repair. Instead, learner display her recipiency and colloborativeness by restating the prior talk, which is immediately oriented with a confirmation token. In this extract, learners are talking about being European and the differences and similarities between their own country and European countries in terms of cuisine, traditions etc. and the sequence starts with EA's selecting FD as the next speaker.

Extract 14 02_2_akyar_atar_cem_duduoglu// being European

```
01   BA:  yeah that's all=

02   EA:  =that's °all° (0.4) okay (0.8) er and ferda (.) what do you

03        think? do you agree with ↓them? ece and berna?=

04   FD:  =yes er i agree with them=

05   EA:  =huh h[uh

06   FD:        [.h and i ↑think (0.5) er: n: now (.) we are (0.5) we are

07        n<u>ot</u> european (1.1) i think er[::
```

```
08   EA:                              [huh h[uh

09   FD:                                    [and we are ↑different from:

10        (0.5) er euro↑peans .hh be↑cause from all behaviours er:

11        reactions food (0.5) to our customs we are different from: (0.9)

12        them=

13   EA:  =huh [huh

14   FD:       [er: i think .h our different features are more than similar

15        features (0.7) er:=

16 → EA:  =we have er: more diffe↑rences ↑than similarities [you say

17   FD:                                                  [yeah

18   FD:  between:=

19   EA:  =[er:

20   FD:   [we and ↓their=

21   EA:  =huh huh=
```

In line 1, BA utters a sequence closer (`yeah that's all`) which is immediately oriented by EA with a repetition in the subsequent line. Preceded by a 0.4 second of silence in line 2, EA utters a compliance token (`okay`) acting as a case closer. After a long pause (0.8), she directs an opinion question by selecting Ferda as the next speaker with 'individual nomination' (Mehan, 1979) by saying her name. In line 3, she initiates the first pair part of the question and answer adjacency pair (`do you agree with ↓them?`) referring to other two learners. In line 4, FD forms the second pair part of the adjacency pair and displays an immediate agreement, which is immediately oriented by EA with a response token in line 5. EA's go-ahead token (`huh [huh`) also acts as an opportunity to pass the turn to other learners. In line 6, FD states her personal stance with many perturbations (i.e. hesitations pause, elongations). Despite FD's disfluencies through her turns and the long hesitation at her turn-final position, EA does not initiate any repair, rather she utters an interest token (`[huh h[uh`) to exhibit her understanding the turn so far (Sacks, 1992, cited Mondana, 2011). By doing so, she passes the chance to hold the floor which is oriented by FD in an overlapped fashion. Between lines 9 and 12, FD extends her turn by exemplifying the differences between Turkish people and the Europeans. In line 13, EA applies to the same strategy with a go-ahead token to support FD's

continuation. Orienting to EA's turn allocation, FD initiates a new turn which acts as a redevelopment of the gist of her previous argument. The 0.7 second of silence and a short hesitation at her turn final position in line 15, are marked as a deadlock in the flow of interaction. Thus, EA immediately takes the turn to restate FD's assertion with a syntactic modification: using the noun forms of adjectives (differences and similarities) and a main verb (have) instead of an auxiliary (are). By doing this, EA demonstrates her understanding by referencing to what is preceded with a post-positioned preface (`[you say`) so that she displays her recipiency. Also, she cultivates collaborativeness by providing the flow of interaction when a deadlock is encountered. This is followed by FD's orientation to EA's collaborativeness with a confirmation token (`[yeah`) uttered in an overlapped fashion in line 17. As it is evident in the analysis, EA positions herself as the manager of the interaction by initiating the topic, allocating turn and providing the flow of interaction through multiple response tokens (lines 5, 8 and 13). The rest of the sequence continues with FD's extension (lines 18 and 20), and EA turns back to her listener position with another go-ahead token in line 21.

The following fragment will present how learners employ reformulation as an embedded repair for language alteration. This extract comes from a group of four who are discussing on the quality of facilities for handicapped people in Turkey and the sequence starts with HA's initiation to shift the topic.

Extract 15 02_6_latif_demiraga_asarli_acar //disabled people

```
01   HA:  by the way i will ask something er: do you remember the: er:

02        conference that we ha:d in (.)oryantasyon /ˌɒrɪənˈteɪʃ(ə)n/

03        program /ˈprəʊgram/ (yeah)

04 → EL:  orientation

05 → EC:  yeah orientation programme i remember it

06        ((laughter))

07   HA:  $sorry$ heh heh heh $i don't know it was in english$

08        ((laughter))
```

In line 1, HA signals a case closure and his upcoming TCU with a turn initial 'by the way' utterance and manages the topic with a preface (`i will ask something`). Following this, he initiates the first pair part of question and answer adjacency pair

by asking a retention question about the event they organized in their campus for disabled people. In line 2, HA utters a code-mixed utterance, an instance of code-mixing, (`oryantasyon program`) at the final position of her turn. In line 04, EL sanctions HA's code-switching by modifying the word (`oryantasyon`) with its English equivalent 'orientation', thereby performing language policing (Amir & Musk 2013). However, she leaves the other code-mixed utterance (`program`) unrepaired. In line 5, EC aligns with EL's language policing with a confirmation token as well as performing another language policing by repairing another Turkish word 'program'. Simultaneously, she forms the second pair part of the adjacency pair (`i remember it`) and marks her shared knowledge about the given event. Preceded by laughter, in line 7, HA states her apology which is combined with laughter, for her switching to Turkish. That also shows her orientation to the rule of the monolingual target language use. In the same line, her last TCU (`i don't know it was in english`) is an explicit claim of her insufficient knowledge (Sert & Walsh, 2013). By doing so, she claims her unfamiliarity with these English words, thus claiming a gap in her linguistic repertoire. Additionally, she combines her turn with laughter which is likely to mitigate the 'potentially problematic action' (Potter & Hepburn, 2010). In other words, HA's laughter mitigates her interactional "trouble related to her epistemic access" and "serves to maintain affiliation to promote progressivity" (Sert & Jacknick, 2015, p. 97). In parallel to that, learners all display their affiliation to HA's mitigation and progressivity of interaction by closing the case with laughter.

As a final point, this example has shown a collaborative production of reformulation by two different learners in two subsequent turns (lines 4 and 5). While in line 4, repair is deployed as an embedded correction, it is more implicitly constructed by EC in line 5 with a confirmation token and extension with the second pair part of the adjacency pair (`i remember it`).

To sum up, this extract has shed light on another characteristic of reformulation in L2 learner-learner interaction. The analysis has revealed a collaborative employment of reformulation by two different parties to invite a learner to the rule of the monolingual target language use. Also, by providing the English equivalents of code-mixed utterances, reformulations provide learners with an opportunity to realize the gap in their linguistic repertoire, thus increasing their interlanguage awareness.

The following extract will exemplify how learners orient to reformulations when they are employed to provide a help for a word searched. In this extract, students are discussing on TV series, and they talk about the reasons of their preferences for foreign or Turkish ones.

Extract 16 01_04_ bektas_konamaz_hacar//TV series

```
01   AH:  $yeah$ i'm (0.5) er:: i'm not nationalist an°d° in: ↑the tv series
02        (.) ↓especially in tv series(0.4) er: ↑i like turkish (.) tv series
03        but(0.8) er: what you like said err: as i said (0.6) it's more
04        ↑boring .hhh it's so long and its takes err:: two hours to: ↑watch
05        it .hhh just episodes took two ↑hours (0.4)er: you should watched
06        the er how can i say the (0.5) previous err short ones=
07  →AK:  =yes summary [you say
08   AH:               [su- >ye- yes< summary and the ads in turkey ↑so many
09        ads in er:=
10   AK:  =[yeah]
11   EB:   [ye:]s::
12   AH:  ↓series
```

In line 1, AH initiates his turn with an affirmative particle which acts as a confirmation of the previous turn, and from line 1 to line 5, he takes on a personal stance on Turkish TV series. Preceded by a 0.4 second of silence and a short hesitation, he engages in an explicit word (`how can i say`) in line 6. Following this, he initiates a self-repair with a definite article (`the`) and pauses for 0.5 seconds, which can be interpreted as his endeavour to recall the word. Yet, he completes the repair by describing his intended meaning (`previous err short ones`) so that he solicits help from the others. In line 7, AK immediately orients to his word search with an acknowledgement token (`=yes`), and she provides a candidate response (`summary`) with a post positioned preface (`you say`), which is the reformulation of AK's description. With an overlap, AH takes the candidate word up and displays his orientation to it with a cut-off (`[su-`) and a rapidly uttered confirmation token (`>ye-yes<`) in line 8. Following this, he uses the candidate words to go back to his main sequence and extends his turn (`summary and the ads in turkey`). Apparently, reformulation is used as a repair initiator to substitute a word search, which is explicitly realized with 'how can I say' formulaic phrase (Brouwer, 2003).

Yet, word search is not initiated because of the learner's insufficient knowledge, rather he displays a difficulty in recalling the word. This claim can be supported by both his self-repair (i.e. describing the word) and his immediate orientation in the subsequent line with an overlap. Furthermore, he takes the word up to complete her last TCU in line 5 (`you should watched`), which is interrupted by a word search. Thus, reformulations are constructed by two different learners to co-construct the meaning.

The following two extracts are similar in terms of orientations displayed to reformulations but the function of the reformulation is slightly different. It occurs in the form of alternative wording which is more appropriate considering the context. In this fragment the topic is gay marriage and the discussion is carried on whether it should be legal or not in their country (Turkey).

Extract 17 04-Kor-Talipoglu-Samanci//Gay Marriage

```
01   MS:   [°yeah° .hh ↑i want to ask another: er question .hh↑ what do you

02         think er that (.) if your: kids(0.4) er:: ↑has a: your kids for

03         example er:: you have a son and .hh er::: he say that er:::

04         ↑mother or dad (0.3)↓i have a boyfriend

05   KT:   i would [be very sorry about that]

06   EK:          [$wow what would you do$]

07   KT:   but er: i (0.4) trying to: er: i would be trying to er::: (0.2)

08         s:::ome:: so↑lution of ↑that er ↓for example the doctors. hh er:

09         [er:

10 → MS:   [psycholo[gists

11   KT:           [if (0.7) yes psychologists .hh er:: if er:: the reason

12         of this er:: prob↑lem er emotio↑nal er:: i er:::: ↑go together

13         with my children er:: (0.4)psychology .hh or it's: hormonal ↑thing

14         .hh er: i er bring (0.2) my children(.)to the doctor a:nd er:::m

15         (0.6)there is ↑no ↓solution .hh i erm:::::

16   MS:   [you accept it

17   KT:   [must be accepted(0.3)

18   MS:   yeah
```

In line 1, MS requests a topic shift (`↑i want to ask another: er question`) and initiates the first pair part of question and answer adjacency pair with an opinion question (`what do you think`) on having a gay child. In line 5, KT self-selects herself as the next speaker, and forms the second pair part of the adjacency pair to mention her possible reaction, which is overlapped by EK's hypothetical question uttered in a smiley voice. In line 7, KT initiates her turn with a contrastive marker (`but`) to direct the topic to a possible solution such as counselling a doctor. At her turn final position, KT displays perturbations (i.e. out-breath and hesitation) and that is interpreted as a word search by MS. Thus, MS orients to the word search and reformulates KT's utterance (`doctors`) as (`[psycholo[gists`) in line 10. Overlapping MS's alternative word on the last syllable, KT initiates an 'if-clause' and pauses for 0.7 seconds. Following this, she orients to MS's reformulation with a stressed acknowledgement token (`yes`) and with a repetition which is followed by an elaboration between lines 11 and 15. Importantly, in line 13, KT uses the name of the field (`psychology`) to refer to the profession (`[psycholo[gists`), which is evident in the context of her turn. Combining the reformulated utterance with a new turn shows KT's uptake and this can be seen as an opportunity to enhance linguistic repertoire in a target language.

Extract 18 is another part of the discussion mentioned in Extract 16 and it will also demonstrate how a reformulation which is deployed as a resource for an interactional trouble, is overcome through reformulation.

Extract 18 1_4_ bektas_konamaz_hacar// Tv series- part 2

```
01 AK:   er:: er: i want to: say something er ↑lastly: er::: all in all

02       er::: are preferences er: is .hhh ↑thing er: make who we are .hhh

03       so: er:::

04 →AH:  our choice ↑is (0.3) [↑make ↓ who we are

05 AK:                        [yes $i couldn't say but you understand$

06        ((laugh))

07 AK:   so:: er:: er:: either turkish ↑ones: or er: serious ↑ones: er::

08       it's: ↑matter of choice .hhh so:: er:: (0.6) everyone (0.8)is

09       free: to: what you: gonna:
```

```
10  EB:    °wa[tch°

11  AK:    [watch
```

From line 1 to line 4, AK requests for a final elaboration on topic by touching upon the importance of people's preferences on their lives. Considering the disfluencies and the long hesitation at her turn-final position as a display of trouble, in line 4, AH ensures his recipiency through reformulating AK's previous turn. His reformulation includes an alternative wording (choice) and a correction of singularity/plurality (`preferences er: is→our choice ↑is`), thus providing a more accurate and fluent statement. AK displays an immediate orientation by interrupting AH's reformulation with an overlap in line 5 to express her trouble to convey the intended meaning.

As observed in Extract 15, laughter is employed as an interactional resource to "index an interactional trouble" (Sert & Jacknick, 2015) and to mitigate the "potentially problematic action" (Potter & Hepburn, 2010, p. 1552). In other words, AK moderates her own challenges by combining her utterance with laughter (Jacknick, 2013) and points to something laughable (Sert & Jacknick, 2015). This is followed by EB and AH affiliations displayed with laughter (Glenn & Holt, 2013; Haakana, 2002; Jacknick, 2013; Potter & Hepburn,2010). Therefore, this sequence has also exemplified how reformulation maintains mutual understanding when a learner signals her trouble with disfluencies and perturbations. Finally, but most importantly, AK' uptake of the word 'choice' to use it in a new formulation can be seen as a learning opportunity created thanks to reformulation. More evidence for learners' uptake will be provided in the following two extracts, the first of which is about English language education system in Turkey. Three students are talking about the difficulties they have in some language skill courses such as listening, speaking and writing because of their grammar-based language backgrounds.

Extract 19 03_5_konakcı_keser_tufan// English language education system in Turkey

```
01   EK:   still still >we are not< .hh i think. er: .hh we should practice

02         mo:re. (0.6) we should learn more .hh er: o↑kay,in university >our

03         teachers< are trying to .hh give us those s↑kills .hh but er: we

04         have our ba:se er:: (.) with no: english

05   SK:   huh huh

06   EK:   no .hh er:: so: it's- >so hard< for us to .hh (.) adapt it (0.7)

07         er: suddenly .hh er: a:nd (0.5) we are learning it since yeah >like

08         you said< we were te:n years old er: (0.5) ↑but <we are learning>

09         .hh the same things every year

10   ET:   ° yeah°

11   EK:   [since

12 → SK    [it repeats [you say

13   EK:              [yeah

14   SK:   every year it [repeats.

15   EK:                 [it repeats .hh just er: adding something, but >this

16         is for us< for language [students

17   SK:                          [learners

18   EK:   .hh er: but the >other ones< they: learn >the same things<every

19         year
```

From line 1 to line 4, EK states the necessity of practice to develop the language skills which they are not competent enough due to their grammar-based instruction backgrounds. In line 5, SK displays agreement with a response token (`huh huh`), and elaborates on the topic. Between the lines 6 and 9, she expresses the difficulties in adapting to this skill-based instruction at their university years on behalf of other learners with a stress on the word (`learning`) (line 7) and (`same`) (line 9). She also complains about learning the same topics since the early years of their language education, which is ratified by ET in the subsequent turn. With an overlap, EK and SK simultaneously attempt to take the turn. Holding the floor in line 12, SK reformulates EK's prior turn (`<we are learning> .hh the same things every year`) as (`[it repeats`). She realizes her reformulation more explicitly with a preface (`[you say`) and provides a simplified version of EK's utterance (`<we`

are learning>.hh the same things every year). In other words, SK's modification acts as redevelopment of the gist of EK's turn, which is followed by EK's orientation with a confirmation token in an overlapped fashion in line 13. In line 14, SK produces another reformulation by combining SK's last two utterances (`every year`) with her first reformulation (`it [repeats.`) This is also oriented by SK by using the word to elaborate on the topic.

The last excerpt below will exemplify how an up-taken utterance is employed as a repair initiator in the following seconds of interaction. In this sequence, discussion is made by a group of three on limits of freedom. Right before this sequence, SK shifts the topic with a claim that TV channels in Turkey are biased, and she elaborates on topic with an example.

Extract 20: 03_4_karakoyun_kerpic_kilic// limits of freedom

```
01  SK:    >for example< every (.) party↓ has an (0.6) channel↓(1.3) and

02         then they say their ideas in that- ↑by that way .hh so (1.2) for

03         example< (.) you support a party and you always [watch

04  EK:                                                    [watch that channel=

05  SK:    =yes

06         (2.2)

07  EK:    and it makes our point of view (0.9) narrow=

08 →SK:    =restricted yes (0.7) er:: (1.4) ↑television (.) is  both (0.7) not

09         objective↓(.) and (1.1) [er::

10  EK:                            [restricted

11  SK:    res-rest->restricted< i think for example .hh er:: (2.3)last

12         week we have .hh er:: (1.0) an protesto in ankara

13  EK:    yes
```

Between lines 1 and 3, SK puts forwards a claim that there are some TV channels biased to favour certain political parties in Turkey, and they are mostly followed by the supporters of these parties. In line 4, EK interrupts SK's turn with an overlap and completes the turn. In line 5, SK displays an immediate orientation and the interaction pauses for 2.2 seconds of silence (line 6). The flow is maintained by EK with a new turn initiation by making an inference from the prior argument (`and it makes our point of view (0.9) narrow=`). In line 8, SK produces

reformulation with an alternative wording (`restricted`), which also shows her agreement. Preceded by a 0.7 second of silence, SK signals her possible continuation with a stretched turn-medial hesitation marker but no extension is provided for 1.4 seconds in line 8. Following this, she initiates a new TCU and completes it after a lengthy pause (0.7) in line 9. Marking the long pause as a word search, EK initiates a repair with an overlap by providing a candidate word (`[restricted`) which has been offered as a reformulation in line 8. Consequently, it can be strongly claimed that EK takes the reformulated utterance up and uses it as a repair initiator in an appropriate context to provide a candidate utterance, which gets a strong orientation by SK with a repetition including two cut-offs and a fast pace (`res-rest->restricted`) in line 11. After the trouble is cooperatively repaired, the sequence is continued with SK's turn extension.

In this section, 10 extracts have been analysed in order to find an answer to the question of how learners display orientations to reformulations. The findings of the analysis will be summarised in the following section.

4.2.1. Summary of the Section

The analysis has exemplified learners' (non)orientations to reformulation constructed to perform a variety of actions which mostly correspond with the previous section (4.1). A general framework for the section is provided in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Learners' (Non)Orientations to Reformulation

	Action	*Sequential Position of the orientation*	*Orientation*
Extract 11	Alignment	x	Non-orientation
Extract 12	Agreement	x	Non-orientation
Extract 13	1. Other-correction	Delayed (2.8 seconds)	Repetition
	2. other correction	In the third turn	Immediate repetition
Extract 14	Demonstration of understanding	In the third turn	Yeah with an overlapped
Extract 15	Other correction and other repair by two different learners	In the third turn	CIK combined with laughter

Extract 16	Other-repair (word search)	In the third turn	Yes+ repetition with an overlap
Extract 17	Other- repair (alternative wording)	In the third turn	Emphasized yes +repetition
Extract 18	Other-repair (re-developing the gist of the preceding talk)	In the third turn	Reporting inability to convey the meaning combined with laughter
Extract 19	Demonstration of understanding	In the third turn	Yeah with an overlapped
Extract 20	Agreement	In the third turn	Repetition

To start with, learners generally reformulate to demonstrate their understanding and to repair a trouble (i.e. word search, perturbations and disfluencies, code-switching) signalled in various ways in the flow of interaction. Reformulations are realized either explicitly with a preface 'you say' or in the form of embedded repair and embedded correction (Extract 13). Along with displaying adequate recipiency and initiating repair, the analysis has also revealed that learners position themselves as experts and moderators of the discussion by inviting others to the rule of the monolingual target language use.

On the one hand, Extract 11 and 12 have demonstrated that learners do not show orientation to reformulation, which is evident in the subsequent long pauses, when they are also employed as an embedded repair for grammatical mistakes. This can be explained by the primary function of reformulation; namely, reformulations have been employed to display alignment (Extract 11) and agreement (Extract 12), which do not necessitate any orientation. Additionally, as the learners display sufficient recipiency of what is preceded and as the grammatical mistakes do not endanger the mutuality, it can be claimed that they employ 'let it pass' strategy (Firth, 1996) by showing non-orientation to the repair embedded in the reformulations.

On the other hand, reformulations are generally followed by learners' orientation, many of which are provided in an overlapped fashion either with a confirmation token' yeah/yes' (Extracts 14 and 19) or the repetition of the reformulation (Extracts 13 and 19), or combination of them (Extracts 16 and 17). Besides, learners also show their orientation by claiming no knowledge (Extract 15) or by reporting a problem in conveying meaning (Extract 18). In these cases, they combine their orientation with an interactional resource (laughter) to index an interactional trouble (Sert & Jacknick, 2015) and to mitigate the potentially problematic action (Potter &

Hepburn, 2010). With reference to language learning, the analysis has uncovered how learners have created learning opportunities through reformulations which are evident in their uptake of the reformulated utterance. It is clear that when reformulations are employed as other-correction, learners position themselves as an expert in the target language. Similarly, learners adopt a novice role when they request help for a lexical item. Thus, the excerpts in which such novice and expert status have been observed with relevance to learners' uptakes are given in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Reformulation, Language Expertise and Learners' Uptake

	Reformulation	*Language expertise*	*Learners' uptake*
Extract 3		providing the meaning of unknown word	Reformulation is the demonstration of uptake
Extract 7	Repair for a word search	Providing a candidate utterance	No uptake but repetition
Extract 8	Correction for a problematic word use	Correcting the problematic word	No uptake but repetition
Extract 10	other correction for a grammar mistake	Correcting the problematic utterance	Combine with an utterance
Extract 13	Other correction for a grammar mistake	Correcting a problematic utterance	Combine with an utterance
Extract 15	Other correction for code-mixed utterance	Providing the English equivalent (language policing)	No uptake but CIK
Extract 16	Other-repair word search	Providing a candidate utterance	Combine with an utterance
Extract 17	Other-repair word search	Providing an alternative wording	Use in a new TCU
Extract 18	Repair – redeveloping the gist		Uptake of an item in reformulated turn
Extract 19	Demonstration of understanding		Combining with new utterance
Extract 20	Demonstration of understanding		Using as a repair source

4.3. Conclusion

This section illustrated different ways reformulations are employed by learners in their group discussion as well as their (non)orientation to reformulation practices. In the following section, the overall findings will be discussed with their implications for research and practice as well as the limitations of the study.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the findings will be discussed in relation to relevant literature and the conclusion of the study will be provided. The chapter consists of four main sections. In 5.1., the first research question "In what ways do reformulations unfold in multi-party L2 interaction" will be discussed in terms of their sequential construction as well as the resources that are employed by the learners to realize their reformulations more explicitly. This section will be divided into two sub-sections: 5.1.1. reformulation as demonstration of understanding, and 5.1.2., reformulation as other-repair and other-correction. In the second section (5.2.), learners' orientation to reformulation will be discussed and it will be followed by implications for foreign language education (5.3.). In the fourth section, the chapter will be concluded with the limitations of the study and recommendations for future studies.

5.1. Sequential Unfolding of Reformulations in Multi-party L2 Interaction

Reformulations can be defined as learners' interactional accomplishment in a target language, thus their conversational accomplishment should be a topic in its own right to be investigated within their social interaction. Drawing on that, this study aimed at exploring how learners interactionally employ these everyday conversational devices as they interact in a target language to accomplish intersubjectivity. Learners' reformulations can be defined as an interactional process of selecting and working-up the prior talk, which is primarily accomplished by means of the everyday conversational practice of formulating. Reformulations can include more complicated and sophisticated modification or much simpler versions of prior talk.

Parallel with Heritage and Watson's (1979) study, learners employed reformulation to demonstrate their understanding while they are explicating, translating, summarising and furnishing the gist of what is preceded, thus, making their conversation as an orderly phenomenon (Davis,1986). Drawing upon the findings, it is evident that most of the reformulations in this analysis fall into Heritage and Watson's (1979) first category, that is they are gist (re)formulations which serve as clarifications, or demonstrations of comprehension obtained thus far. To this end, in 5.1.1., the sequential positions of reformulations will be discussed in relation to the most typical actions they perform.

5.1.1. Sequential Organization of Reformulations: Demonstration of Understanding

Sacks (1992) explains 'how understanding is shown' by pointing to the fact that participants make different forms of understanding available by performing some kinds of operation on the previous turn. Within these five extracts, reformulations were constructed to demonstrate learners' understanding while they were also performing some other actions such as confirmation, agreement, displaying recipiency, and cultivate collaborativeness.

In the analysis, two extracts have illustrated the employment of reformulation to verify accurate recipiency. While in Extract 1 reformulation was constructed to provide confirmation, in Extract 2 it was produced to request for confirmation. These two extracts are similar in terms of reformulations sequential position in the sequence in that both were positioned as a part of adjacency pair despite being different parts. While it formed the second pair part of an adjacency pair to provide confirmation, it was the first part to request for confirmation. Thus, it is evident that these sequential positions are consistent with Heritage and Watson's (1979) argument which reformulations are formatted as adjacency pairs with a preference for agreement/confirmation. However, in contrast to Heritage and Watson's (1979) claim, reformulations were not oriented in adjacent utterances when they were constructed to display agreement and disagreement (Extracts 3 and 4). Rather, they occurred as independent TCUs both of which were preceded by long pauses. That can be explained with one of the characteristics of reformulation revealed by Clayman's (1993) work on reformulated questions. According to Clayman (1993), one of the basic features characteristically associated with most reformulation is that "the reformulation is asserted as a preface to further talk page" (p. 163). Similarly, learners displayed their agreement and disagreement through reformulating what was previously argued and they constructed a further talk on their reformulations.

Sacks (1992) defines 'understanding positions' as specific sequential environments within talk for ''doing understanding", and Mondana (2011) gives a story completion as example of this position. She states that using a proverbial expression can exhibit recipients' possible understanding and a similar case has also been observed in Extract 5 in which the recipient's understanding was exhibited with a formulaic language. In this extract, the learners 'did understanding' by reformulating the

previous utterance through echoing the prior talk rather than performing some other actions. Additionally, the function of reformulation can be linked to a particular class of recipient actions offered by Waring (2002): substantive recipiency which "consists in the verbal resources deployed by discussion participants to indicate "I'm following you" or "I'm trying to follow you" without actually saying so" (p. 454).

Another important point is the next actions which were projected by reformulation as the learners demonstrate their understanding. It has been observed that reformulations were followed by an elaboration on turn by the learners who constructed it. For instance, providing confirmation with a similar-structured reformulation (i.e. get used to → get accustomed to), the learner elaborated on the topic by giving an example to clarify her preceding argument (Extract 1). Similar cases have been observed in Extracts 3 and 4 in which reformulations were constructed as prefaces to elaborate on the topic by displaying agreement and disagreement respectively. On the other hand, in Extract 2, reformulation was followed by a speaker change, which can be explained with the function of reformulation. To clarify, as reformulation was produced to request for confirmation, it was provided by a third party rather than the one whose turn was being reformulated. Therefore, this extract has illustrated how reformulation contribute to learners' collaboratively accomplishment of mutuality, thus intersubjectivity in an ongoing interaction. A different case has been illustrated in Extract 5 in which reformulation acted as a sequence closure after accomplishing a mutual understanding. More interestingly, the interactional work of reformulation differs from the other fragments because it did not serve to verify comprehension or display (dis)agreement. Rather, it was employed to echo the prior utterance with the aim of displaying substantive recipiency and cultivating collaborativeness (Waring, 2002).

Most of the extracts have illustrated how reformulations were deployed as other-repair or other-correction. Thus, the sequential position of reformulation will be discussed in the following section.

5.1.2. Sequential Organization of Reformulations as Other-Repair and Other-Correction

In the data, a word search (Extract 7), a problematic word use (Extract 8), a code-mixed utterance (Extract 9), a noticeable grammar mistake (Extract 10) or learners'

potential problem of formulating an appropriate turn (Extract 6) were treated as troubles which were repaired through reformulations. These troubles were signalled either explicitly (How can I say) or implicitly though perturbations, disfluencies or self-repetitions. Additionally, when a trouble was occurred as a result of recalling or uttering a lexical item, repair was initiated by defining the word searched. In the form of a repair, learners' reformulations targeted representing a long turn or a specific component such as a lexical item within a turn, one part of a TCU, a grammatical mistake or a code-mixed utterance, and its sequential organization formed a triadic sequence in all repair trajectories found in the data. Put otherwise, a trouble was signalled and followed by a reformulation in the form of a phrasal TCU or a long turn with many TCUs. In the third turn, orientation was provided with a repetition, an acknowledgement or a confirmation token. This sequence can be exemplified using a simplified version of Extract 6:

```
01 GA:    students i'm not sure er teachers shouldn't be a dresscode

02  MC:   for students?

03  GA:   er should be

04 →MC:   so you say there shouldn't be for ↑teachers but there should be

05        for students

06  GA:   yes
```

Thus, this triadic sequence can be generalized as follows:

    A: initiation

    B: reformulation

    A: orientation

As can be seen in Extract 6, a trouble was encountered to formulate an appropriate turn and it was signalled with perturbations and disfluencies. It was followed by a reformulation which included an alteration in the syntactic or structural form of the utterance. Therefore, reformulation provided a better-structured utterance by redeveloping the linguistic features, thereby making the gist of the previous utterances much clearer. In such a case, reformulations did not alter the content but presented what was preceded in a more fluent and accurate way. As learners employ this type of reformulation to make the meaning certain, it bears some

similarities to one of the reformulation categories identified by Chiang and Mi (2011); namely, replicative reformulation which refers to reformulating the preceding utterance in terms of its key information to make certain what is said is actually what is meant.

In Extract 7, trouble was related to inability to produce or recall a lexical utterance, which was signalled with self-repetition, hesitation, and a very long pause (2.7). Even though this long pause can be regarded as an interference in this sequence, it can be explained as learners' preference for EK's self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). As mentioned in Chapter 4, this can also be interpreted as 'getting it right' (Schegloff, 1997) which refers to displaying non-orientation to repair invitation and giving the floor to the learner to initiate or do self-repair. It is worth mentioning that reformulations which targeted representing a word search were constructed in the form of phrasal TCU and this was also the case for a code-mixed utterance. For example, in Extract 9, the learner switched to the mother language (Turkish) and reformulation was constructed as an embedded repair by translating the code-mixed utterance into the target language. The interactional work of reformulation is similar to the work by Ziegler et al. (2012) in which reformulation is employed as an embedded repair rather than sanctioning the use of multilingual resources. Importantly, this kind of reformulation is also considered as an act of language policing as it functions as reminding the target language use only (Amir & Musk, 2013).

In two sequences, reformulations acted as embedded correction (Extracts 8 and 10) that is they were not preceded or followed by any confirmation token or acknowledgement token to display orientation to what was previously said. They were constructed to replace a problematic vocabulary use (Extract 8) and to correct a grammatical mistake (Extract 10). Apparently, these mistakes were not followed by a negative evaluation, rather they were replaced with correct forms. Thus, the interactional work of reformulation in these sequences is consistent with Seedhouse's (2004) categorization in which reformulation is constructed to provide a correction without using a negative evaluation by replacing the erroneous form with a correct form.

Deployment of reformulation as correction and repair can be explained with the types of troubles and their effects on meaning. That is to say, reformulations were

produced in the form of embedded repair for a code-mixed utterance (Extract 9) since it did not threaten the meaning, rather it was constructed to remind the target language rule only in accordance with the task rule. Yet, when the trouble resulted from a grammatical mistake which may blur the meaning (Extract 10), reformulation was produced in the form of correction. Moreover, a preference for corrective function was also observed when a problematic vocabulary was taken up by another party (Extract 8). Even though these five extracts are similar in terms of their sequential positions, they bear differences as for the next action that reformulation projects. Put otherwise, reformulations in these repair trajectories were followed by a turn allocation (Extract 6), a speaker change (Extract 7) and going back to the main sequence (Extracts 8, 9 and 10) after orienting to repair with the repetition of the candidate utterance.

To sum up, in line with the studies reviewed in Chapter 2, the primary action of reformulation was defined as demonstration of understanding and making the meaning clearer for the interactants. As they were 'doing understanding', they also accomplished some other actions. Additionally, reformulations were deployed as repair and correction mechanisms when learners encountered troubles to maintain the flow of interaction. As for the sequential organizations of reformulations, three forms have been observed: adjacency pairs, independent TCUs in the second position and triadic repair trajectories.

5.1.3. Resources Employed for Reformulations

Linguistic resources which preface reformulation have been identified in different studies. These prefaces can be a conjunction (e.g. so) or a wh- particle 'what' in the form of what you are saying (Gonzales, 1996 as cited in Waring, 2002, p.458). Also, it can be a state token 'oh' (Jurafsky, Shriberg and Biasca,1997 cited Waring, 2002). Hauser (2006) also exemplifies the use of discourse marker 'so' to mark what comes next as a reformulation, and according to Waring (2002) instances of reformulations can be introduced with the explicit prefaces such as 'you are saying/suggesting'. Kapellidi (2015) also emphasizes the function of 'you say' preface as making the introduction of reformulation explicit.

The analysis has revealed similar findings in terms of linguistic resources resorted by the learners which are given in Table 1 and 2 in section 4.1.3. Learners'

reformulation practices bear resemblances to the previous studies in terms of the linguistic resources accompanying reformulations, which is apparent in the simplified version of Extract 6.

```
07  GA:    students i'm not sure er teachers shouldn't be a dresscode

08  MC:    for students?

09  GA:    er should be

10 →MC:    so you say there shouldn't be for ↑teachers but there should be

11         for students

12  GA:    yes
```

Reformulations were generally combined with the preface 'you say' to refer to what had been uttered and to signal the following turn would be a restatement of the previous rather than a new formulation. In parallel with Kapellidi's (2015) and Waring's (2002) arguments, 'you say' was employed to introduce the reformulation, and as Hauser (2006) identifies, 'so' functioned to signal what came next as a reformulation. Importantly, these prefaces were not always positioned before the reformulation at the initial position of turns, there were some sequences in which they occurred in the post position right after reformulations. A similar combination of two linguistic resources was observed when reformulation functioned as a predisagreement move. While it was preceded by 'you say' to demonstrate the comprehension of the talk thus far but also it is followed by 'I don't think so' to construct a disagreement on the demonstration of understanding. In this case of displaying agreement, 'I have the same opinion with you' accompanied reformulation in pre-position. It is worth noting that the positions of prefaces in agreement and disagreement actions need more consideration to prevent a possible threat for the mutual understanding. That is to say, to construct her disagreement, the learner first displayed her accurate recipiency through reformulating the previous talk by an explicit realization with 'you say'. By doing so, she created a strong base for her argumentative talk. As shown in Extract 2, the preface 'do you think' provided reformulation with interrogative function to request for confirmation. As for providing it, reformulation was preceded with a confirmation token 'yes' as in Extract 1. Employment of 'yes' as a prepositioned preface was also observed in Extract 9 when reformulation was provided for a code-mixed utterance. Accordingly, it can be claimed that combining reformulation with a confirmation token softens the

corrective function of reformulation. In addition, as a receipt token in Extract 9, 'yes' eases the effects of language policing performed.

Along with these linguistic resources, learners accompanied their reformulations with some interactional resources. For instance, in Extract 2, the interrogative function of reformulation was supported by a rising and questioning intonation in the last utterance, so that invitation for an understanding check was signalled much more explicitly. Another striking example is Extract 5 in which reformulation was combined with laugher marking reformulation as something laughable (Sert & Jacknick, 2015). Therefore, the learner displays her attentive recipiency and contribution to the collaborativeness in the ongoing interaction.

In the data, it has been observed that reformulations in Extracts 3 and 4 were preceded by long pauses (0.8) and (0.6) respectively. That can be interpreted as learners' tendency to provide the continuation of interaction by displaying their agreement and disagreement. Yet, the third sequence (Extract 7) displayed a word search and the pause was much longer (2.7) when compared to previous two extracts. Schegloff (1997) argues that this kind of long pauses in repair trajectories is called 'getting it right' which refers to giving the floor to do self-repair. An interactional resource (i.e. questioning intonation) was also resorted when reformulation was formed as an embedded correction for a noticeable grammar mistake (Extract 10). The use of accentuation can be interpreted as drawing learners' attention to the locus of trouble, thus raising their awareness. By doing so, they can invite each other to a collaborative repair for a grammatical mistake. Additionally, this accentuation can be regarded as softening the corrective effect of reformulation in order to eliminate the negative effect which a correction may cause.

This section has provided a general framework for the organisation of reformulation in a multi-party L2 interaction and the focus of the following section will be on the learners' orientation to the reformulation as a part of their interaction.

5.2. Learners' (Non)Orientation to Reformulations

In this section, learners' orientation to the reformulations, which serve to different actions, will be discussed. The data has revealed that most of the reformulations were oriented by the learners in the third turn. They displayed orientations not only to the repair but also to the expert roles displayed through reformulations.

On the one hand, two extracts (Extracts 11 and 12) have been demonstrated learners' non-orientations. However, their non-orientations were displayed to the corrective function of reformulations. That is likely that the grammar mistakes did not cause a threat for the meaning. On the other hand, it can be claimed that learners oriented to the actions performed by reformulations. In other words, reformulations were produced in order to show alignment (Dings, 2014) to topic management (Extract 11) and an agreement to the previous argument (Extract 12). Thus, the topic elaboration which was provided right after the reformulations can be given as the evidence for learners' orientations to the actions served through reformulations.

By contrast, when the grammatical mistake was treated as a threat to meaning making because of the inconsistency in tense selection, modification was provided more explicitly to ensure the mutual understanding. In other words, reformulation was deployed in the form of embedded correction and it was followed by an uptake despite being delayed for a long time from the interactional point of view. This delay can be interpreted as 'doing thinking' (Brouwer, 2003) to realise the (mis)matching between her utterance and the reformulation. Secondly, it can also be argued that with this long pause, the expert role, which was displayed through reformulation, was also challenged. Drawing on the analysis of these three extracts, it can be claimed that if grammar mistakes do not endanger the meaning, learners can 'let it pass' (Firth, 1996) and pursue their discussion. Yet, if the meaning making is treated as in danger, reformulation is provided in the form of embedded correction, which triggers an orientation despite being delayed. In the same extract, a problematic word was corrected with a replacement and it was immediately oriented in the subsequent turn in contrast to the previous one. Thus, it can be strongly argued that reformulation for a problematic word choice triggers an immediate orientation whereas it is non-oriented or orientation is delayed when the locus of the trouble is a grammatical mistake.

As mentioned before, learners position themselves as an expert when reformulations were constructed to in the form of embedded correction. While their expert positions were challenged with a long pause for a grammar correction, they were oriented when correction addressed a problematic word or when they engaged in a word search. Thus, this finding is inconsistent with Reichert and Liebscher's

(2012) study, which claims learners' challenging their peers' expert positions when they engage in a word search.

In the previous section, it has been discussed that learners tended to reformulate to re-develop the gist of the previous turn to make the meaning much clearer and their reformulations functioned as rebroadcasting the prior talk for the sake of others' understanding. It has been observed that in such cases, reformulations were followed by an immediate orientation displayed with a confirmation token (yeah) in an overlapped fashion. This type of reformulation was produced when learners displayed difficulty in formulating an appropriate and clear turn to convey their intended meaning. Therefore, it can be claimed that it triggers an immediate orientation to ensure mutual understanding, thereby intersubjectivity.

One of the sequences in the analysis (Extract 15) is very striking in terms of learners' orientation to reformulations which were produced by two different learners in the subsequent turns when their counterpart switched to their mother language (i.e. Turkish). However, these two subsequent reformulations differ in terms of their deployment. While the first reformulation was in the form of embedded correction, the other was realized more implicitly with a prepositioned confirmation token by forming the second pair part of the adjacency pair. The orientation to reformulation is different from the other sequences in that it was fulfilled by CIK (Sert & Walsh, 2013) with the combination of an interactional resource (i.e. laughter) which is likely to mitigate the interactional trouble related to the learner's epistemic access. (Sert & Jacknick, 2015). Importantly, this orientation is also shown to expert role of the learner who provided reformulation as an embedded correction by putting herself into more knowledgeable position. Drawing on that, it can be claimed that reformulating a code-mixed utterance can draw learners' attention to the gap in their interlanguage, and they can create an opportunity for their language learning when they orient to their expert positions.

When reformulation is provided for a word search which is either expressed explicitly (i.e. how can I say in Extract 16) or implicitly (i.e. hesitations in Extract 17), it triggers an immediate orientation in the subsequent turn with the repetition of the reformulated utterance with repositioned acknowledgement token. Also, learners' uptaking the reformulated utterances and incorporating them into their turn are the evidence of their orientations. Moreover, learners reformulated when their peers

signalled difficulty in conveying their intended meaning appropriately. In such a case (Extract 18), reformulation accomplished a repair for the previous turn including disfluencies and it was followed by an immediate orientation in the subsequent turn without waiting the turn completion. Importantly, in most of the sequences, the orientation was initiated with a confirmation token (i.e. yes), but it was not pursued with the repetition of the reformulated utterance. More interestingly, orientation was provided with the learner's acceptance of her inability to convey her intended meaning (`$i couldn't say`) and it included an utterance which proved the maintenance of the mutuality (`but you understand$`).

Consequently, when reformulation was constructed to maintain mutuality, an immediate orientation was displayed to verify intersubjectivity. Without any intent to repair any trouble, learners displayed their accurate recipiency by reformulating either a full sentence (Extract 19) or a lexis in the previous turn (Extract 20). While orientation was provided by a confirmation token for the first, the employment of the reformulated utterance as a repair source for a word search displayed a different way of learners' orientation.

All in all, in what way learners show orientation to reformulation performing some specific actions have been discussed in this section. The analysis has revealed that reformulations are mainly followed by learners' orientation in their multi-party L2 discussions and the most typical type of showing orientation is uttering a confirmation token with an overlapped fashion. Also, learners repeated the reformulated utterance or they combined it with a confirmation token. All the orientations were displayed in the third turn and in most cases the reformulated utterances were taken up and incorporated into a new turn. When reformulations were constructed in the form of embedded corrections, learners' orientations were not only to the reformulated utterances but also to the expert role displayed through reformulation.

In Sections 5.1. and 5.2., the characteristics of learners' reformulation and their orientation to them have been discussed. Drawing on that, it will be argued that learners' reformulation practices can be transformed into a learning opportunity in the following section.

5.3. Implications for Foreign Language Education

Even though the primary focus of this thesis is to 'describe' the interactional organization reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction, the findings showed that learners' reformulations have interactional and pedagogical consequences that can inform language learning and teaching practices. Thus far, the characteristics and sequential positions of reformulations have been discussed and it has been argued that learners' reformulation practices bear commonalities to the previous research such as Heritage and Watson's (1979) in terms of their primary employment to demonstrate understanding, overcoming understanding uncertainty (Chiang & Mi 2008), to cultivate the collaborativeness in interaction by displaying substantive recipiency (Waring, 2002) and providing a repair for a code-mixed utterance (Ziegler et.al., 2012). Taking a one more step, whether learners' reformulation practices can pave the way of creating learning opportunities for learners will be the focus of this section.

To start with, syntactically and structurally examined, learners' reformulations provided alternatives in target language use. Resorting to their linguistic repertoires learners offered linguistic modifications to re-produce what was preceded. These modifications included a similar structure (e.g. Extracts 1 and 14), more complicated and sophisticated forms (e.g. Extracts 2 and 4) or a simplified version with a subject and a verb (e.g. Extract 19). In other words, an alteration in sentence structure (i.e. from active to passive form in Extract 4) or in syntactic components of the prior talk (e.g. Extracts 11, 18 and 20) were encountered. Evidently, reformulations help learners present the varieties in their linguistic repertoires to convey the same meaning. Drawing on that, it can be claimed that reformulation can arise learners' awareness of structural and syntactical varieties in the target language and create an opportunity to enrich their linguistic repertoires. This claim can be based on learners' uptakes of reformulated utterances, all of which are given in Table 4. Their uptake can be a partial including a component of reformulation or the whole reformulated utterance. The analysis has revealed that learners took the reformulated utterances up and incorporated them into a new utterance, which can be given as the indicator of their uptakes. To make the argument clearer, simplified version of Extract 20 is given below.

```
01    EK:    and it makes our point of view (0.9) narrow=
```

```
02 →  SK:     =restricted yes (0.7) er:: (1.4) ↑television (.) is

03            both (0.7) not objective↓(.) and (1.1) [er::

04    EK:                                            [restricted

05    SK:     res-rest->restricted< i think for example .hh er:: (2.3)last

06            week we have .hh er:: (1.0) an protesto in ankara
```

As it is clear, reformulation of the prior adjective is taken up and offered as a candidate utterance for the other party engaged in a word search. Drawing on this extract, it can be argued that reformulation can create opportunities for learners' vocabulary development in a target language. Extract 7 can also be given as an evidence for this claim. In this extract, a trouble in finding an appropriate adjective to convey the intended meaning was displayed with self-repetitions which was repaired with a reformulation in the form of a phrasal TCU (like-minded). That it was followed by the orientation of the learner with the repetition of the reformulated utterance can be considered as a learning opportunity for taking up a new word provided with reformulation. Vocabulary learning opportunities can also be created when reformulation is constructed in the form of a translation from native language to the target one. It is evident in Extract 15 that reformulation can serve as a translation mechanism for a code-mixed utterance by providing English equivalent by employing reformulation and can create a slot to match between native and target language use. Importantly, learners' orientation to reformulation was displayed with a CIK (Sert & Walsh, 2013). Thus, it can be claimed that reformulation can help learners realise the gap in their linguistic repertoire and can create an opportunity to acquire the target language equivalent of the code-mixed utterance. Even though an uptake was not observed in this sequence, another fragment (Extract 9) uncovered learner's uptake of a code-mixed utterance (Extract 9). To explain, reformulation of a code-mixed utterance was taken up and combined with an indefinite pronoun (original one) and a similar combination occurred for a grammatical item in Extract 10 and 13. In addition, in Extract 17 a reformulated utterance was taken up and used to construct a new TCU in the forthcoming minutes of interaction while in Extract 18 a component of reformulation was incorporated into a new TCU.

Besides, Extract 3 exemplified the construction of reformulation as an indicator of uptake of an unknown word which was incidentally defined as a learning object. In other words, an unknown vocabulary (eternal) was defined collaboratively as the learning object and the learner demonstrates her uptake by redefining it with a new TCU in a sentence format (love has an end). Thus, her reformulation can be interpreted as the reflection of her micro genetic development (van Compernolle, 2010).

Reichert and Liebscher (2012) claim that negotiation of expert positions is a necessary precondition for learners to engage collaboratively in constructing learning opportunities. Dings (2012) also claims that native expert and non-native novice interaction provide the non-native novice with the opportunity to employ her developing communicative skills under the supervision of the expert who could provide a model, a repair, clarification, and other forms of support as needed in their communication practices. As shown in Table 4, learners adopted such expert and novice roles when reformulations were in the form of other repair or other correction for a problematic word, a noticeable grammar mistake or a word search. More interestingly, the remedial function of reformulation was generally oriented by the learners in the third turn and this orientation was not only to the repair but also to the expert role resulted from their reformulation accomplishments. Thus, it can be argued that learners' orientations to their novice and expert roles, which result from their linguistic asymmetries, can have a positive effect on creating learning opportunities in their interaction especially for their vocabulary development. A study which can support this claim was conducted by Hosoda (2006) who makes language expertise relevant "(a) when one participant invited the other party's repair and (b) when the participants encountered a problem in achieving mutual understanding" (p. 25). In this study, too, learners' reformulations to repair a problematic vocabulary or a word search and their orientations to them provided evidence for their novice and expert roles. As observed in Hosoda's (2006) work, one of the learners assumes the novice role on occasion that she seeks help on L2 vocabulary and repeats corrected words while other learner takes on expert roles when they supply lexical items and pursues L2 speakers' uptake. Such a case has been observed in Extract 17 in which reformulation is provided for a word search and it was taken up by the learner in the following lines. Thus, the findings of the study are consistent

with Hosoda's(2006) work because both claim that participants' novice-expert roles can create opportunities for vocabulary development.

Yet, it is necessary to stress that participants in this study are L2 speakers and there is not a certain predetermined linguistic asymmetry as it is the case in Hosoda's (2006) and Ding's (2012) studies which investigate native and non-native interaction. Also, this study focuses on a language expert paradigm displayed through a more specific practice; namely reformulation. Thus, it can be claimed that creating learning opportunities is not special to novice expert paradigm in native-non-native interactions, and learners' reformulation practices which reveal a novice-expert paradigm can be converted into a learning opportunity in L2 learner-learner interaction. In this point Reichert and Liebscher's (2012) work can be regarded similar in terms of its focus on peer interaction. The findings of this study support their work as both claim that novice and expert roles can be transformed into an opportunity for language learning. Yet, this study differs from their work in one point. That is to say, participants in Reichert and Liebscher's work challenge their expert roles when a candidate word is provided. By contrast, learners' immediate orientation and uptakes have been observed in this study and they did not question their linguistic authorities.

In addition to more specific linguistic components such as grammatical item and lexis, learners' reformulations provided more fluent and accurate language use to redevelop the gist of the prior talk so as to provide clarification in meaning for all interactants. This type of reformulation can be considered as similar to teacher reformulation examined by Hauser (2006). Hauser (2006) claims that the F component of IRF sequence in classroom talk can be a reformulation of learners' previous talk so as to provide more accurate and fluent language use. Similarly, learners' reformulations provided a more fluent and accurate language use for prior talk including some disfluencies (Extracts 6 and 18) and reformulation unfolded in a triadic sequence. In such cases learners' reformulations unfold in the second turn which is followed by an orientation whereas teachers' reformulations occur in the third turn. Consequently, it can be claimed that learners' reformulations in multi-party L2 interaction have similarities to teachers' reformulation in a teacher-learner interaction in terms of the action performed even though they constitute different sequential positions.

To summarize, reformulation is the reflection of one students' linguistic repertoire which expose learners to varieties in a target language. The original utterance and the reformulated version can provide a matching between alternatives or target and non-target forms. In other words, reformulation constitutes a kind of bridge between the target-like and non-target-like language use. Drawing upon the findings, it is evident that learners can create learning opportunities when they reformulate each other's utterances. Their modification can provide more sophisticated language use including structural and syntactical varieties which can contribute to their linguistic repertories. Also, when they deploy reformulation as a repair or correction mechanism, they draw attention to the target like and non-target like matching and provide more accurate and fluent versions to convey the intended meaning. More interestingly, reformulation can be a means by which they reflect their incidental micro genetic development (van Compernolle, 2010) and reformulation itself or a component of it can be defined incidentally as an object and they can be a part of their micro genetic development.

As for language teaching practices, drawing on the findings of the studies mentioned in Chapter 2, this study has also provided further insights on how learners employ reformulation as an interactional mechanism to co-constructed L2 interaction and how opportunities for learning are created by their own with the absence of an epistemic authority. Thus, they should be provided more opportunities in which they can create their own opportunities by deploying reformulation as a reflection of their linguistic repertoire.

5.4. Conclusion

Adopting a purely descriptive perspective, this study has shed light upon the interactional unfolding of reformulation in a multi-party L2 interaction in light of the research questions and by employing a micro-analytic, sequential investigation. Throughout the analysis, the interactional environment of learners' reformulation and their orientations have been explored and implications for L2 learning and teaching practices have been provided. As a final point, limitations of the study and future research directions will be addressed.

5.4.1. Limitations of the Study

In this section, some minor limitations will be discussed with the aim of providing a guideline for the researchers who would like to focus on a similar data set.

It can be claimed that learning and the impact of instruction on learning practices can be uncovered only through a longitudinal study and a potential limitation can be the preference not to follow a longitudinal study even though the quantity of audio recordings is adequate. Yet, the descriptive aim of this study can be given as a response to this potential limitation. This thesis does not aim to bring evidence to development of competencies for learners. Rather, the aim of the thesis is to describe how learners employ reformulation as an interactional resource to maintain intersubjectivity and whether their reformulation practices can create an opportunity for their L2 learning. Thus, longitudinal data is not a prerequisite for the purposes of this thesis. Still, possible changes in learners' reformulation practices over time can be another research topic for longitudinal studies thanks to the adequate data set.

Another limitation is caused by the technical problems that may potentially have an impact on the transcription of the data. Some of the recordings were really poor in quality and there were some external sounds intervening the recording. This problem was treated by consulting the other team members to double check the transcriptions. Also, the recordings analysed in the thesis do not consist of such a quality problem and did not intervene the analysis.

Another potential problem can be related to using audio recordings which may bring issues of validity to the surface. Jenks (2006) states that "although CA relies on both transcripts and recordings, it is often the transcripts that are used for presentation and publication" (p.80) and what is happening actually in the recordings cannot be always reflected through transcripts. Thus, using audio recording can cause another limitation to provide a full description of learners' reformulation practices. One possible direction in the future could be using video recordings to capture some other details in their interaction. Nevertheless, each finding is still an important contribution to the literature as being the first to describe the learners' practices of reformulation by analysing the findings through the robust methodological underpinnings of ethnomethodological CA.

5.4.2. Suggestions for Further Research

Learners' practices of reformulation require further attention to explore their perspectives to provide further insight for their L2 learning process. As this is the first initiation to explore their perspective, I would like to invite further contributions to the growing body of research to bring further insights into the phenomenon. Different proficiency levels may reveal different findings which may come to surface through learners' reformulation. Thus, it would enrich our understanding when different proficiency levels are examined. As discussed in Section 5.3., learners can create their own learning opportunities through reformulation and a close investigation of learners' reformulation practices with a focus on grammatical and linguistic development at turns-at-talk could bring insights into their L2 learning processes.

As mentioned earlier, this thesis is the first comprehensive study that focuses on the reformulation in multi-party L2 interaction. The findings of this thesis may provide a ground for future researches and the phenomenon can be investigated with a longitudinal study in order to bring evidence to learning or development of competencies for learners. Also, thanks to the video recording technology, more researchers can implement a multimodal analysis on the phenomenon to reveal different embodied ways through which interactants perform reformulation. Besides, the phenomenon can be investigated with a focus on grammatical and linguistic development at turns-at-talk to bring insights into a multidimensional view of L2 interaction.

5.4.3. Concluding Remarks

As a final point, I would like to put an emphasis on the researcher stance on the entire project. In contrast to cognitivist/interactionist, researcher-relevant, theory-driven studies individualistic understanding, I adopted an ethnomethodological, CA-informed, participant-relevant, data-driven, social understanding to open up a door to describe the learners practice of reformulation in their interaction. The detailed, minute-by-minute, turn-by-turn, line-by-line analysis of turns-at-talk has enabled me to have a better understanding of a common, but unexplored phenomenon in multi-party interaction; namely learners' reformulation practices. This issue has long been underresearched and I believe that I could draw researchers' attention to learners' reformulation practices in their interaction carried out of a classroom context. I

further observed that learners' reformulation practices could be used as teaching and learning opportunities considering the learning opportunities created by learners through reformulations.

References

Achiba, M. (2012). Development of interactional competence: Changes in participation over cooking sessions. Pragmatics and Society, 3(1). 1-30.

Alfonzetti, G. (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In P. Auer (Ed.), Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity (pp. 180–214). London: Routledge.

Amir, A. (2013). Self-policing in the English as a foreign language classroom. Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 2013, 7(2). 84-105

Balaman, U. (2016). A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Turkey.

Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017). Development of L2 interactional resources for online collaborative task accomplishment. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 1-30.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Abdi, H. (2010). Recast and Its Impact on Second Language Acquisition. International Journal of Language Studies, 4(4).

Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the Role of Recasts in Native-Speaker/Nonnative-Speaker Interactions. Language Learning, 52(1), 1-42.

Brouwer, C. (2003). Word searches in NNS–NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? Modern Language Journal, 87, 534–545.

Brouwer, C. E. & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1(1). 29-47.

Chiang, S. Y., & Mi, H. F. (2008). Reformulation as a strategy for managing 'understanding uncertainty' in office hour interactions between international teaching assistants and American college students. Intercultural education, 19(3), 269-281.

Chiang, S. Y., & Mi, H. F. (2011). Reformulation: a verbal display of interlanguage awareness in instructional interactions. Language Awareness, 20(2), 135-149.

Clayman, S. E. (1993). Reformulating the question: A device for answering/not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 13(2), 159-188.

Clayman, S. E. (2013). Turn-constructional units and the transition-relevance place. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.) The handbook of conversation analysis (150-166). West Sussex: Blackwell.

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 91(1), 45–62.

Davis, K. (1986). The process of problem (re) formulation in psychotherapy1. Sociology of Health & Illness, 8(1), 44-74.

Deppermann, A. (2011). The study of formulations as a key to an interactional semantics. Human Studies, 34(2), 115-128.

Dings, A. (2012). Native speaker/nonnative speaker interaction and orientation to novice/expert identity. Journal of Pragmatics, 44(11), 1503-1518.

Dings, A. (2014). Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. The Modern Language Journal, 98(3). 742-756.

Doehler, S. P. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. Language, Interaction and Acquisition, 4(2), 134-160.

Doehler, S. P., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing "methods" for interaction: a cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. L2 Interactional Competence and Development. Joan Kelly Hall, John Hellermann, and Simona Pekarek Doehler, eds, 206-243.

Drew, P. (2003). Comparative analysis of talk-in-interaction in different institutional settings: A sketch. Studies in language and social interaction: In honor of Robert Hopper, 293-308.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. Language learning, 51(2), 281-318.

Fasel Lauzon, V., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Focus on form as a joint accomplishment: An attempt to bridge the gap between focus on form research and conversation analytic research on SLA. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 51(4), 323-351.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. Journal of Pragmatics 26: 237–59.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. The Modern Language Journal, 81(3). 285-300.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1998). SLA property: No trespassing!. The Modern Language Journal, 82(1), 91-94.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be a response to Firth and Wagner. The Modern Language Journal, 82(1), 83-90.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), Theoretical sociology: Perspectives and developments (pp. 337–366). New York: Meredith.

Glenn, P., & Holt, E. (Eds.). (2013). Studies of laughter in interaction. A&C Black.

Haakana, M. (2002). Laughter in medical interaction: From quantification to analysis, and back. Journal of sociolinguistics, 6(2), 207-235.

Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. Applied Linguistics, 14(2). 145-166.

Hall, K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (ed.), Culture in second language teaching and learning (137-152). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. The Modern Language Journal, 88(4), 607-612.

Harness Goodwin, M., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. Semiotica, 62(1-2), 51-76.

Hauser, E. (2006). Teacher Reformulations of Students. Answers during an Episode of Pedagogical Talk. Bulletin of the University of Electro-Communications, 19(1-2), 93-99

Hauser, E. (2013). Stability and change in one adult's second language English negation. Language Learning 63(3). 463-498.

Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36(2), 109-141.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 88(4), 568-582.

Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. Applied Linguistics, 27(3). 377-404

Hellermann, J. (2008). Social actions for classroom language learning. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. L2 interactional competence and development, 147-172.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.) The handbook of conversation analysis (57-76). West Sussex: Blackwell.

Heritage, J., & Watson, D. R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology, 123-162.

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 (299–345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. Applied Linguistics, 27(1), 25-50.

Hutchby, I. (1996). Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk radio show. Discourse & Society, 7(4), 481-497

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt (2008). Conversation Analysis (2nd edn), Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of ne in L2 Japanese during study abroad. Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives, 351-385.

Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese. Development of interactional competence during on-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (eds.), L2 learning as social practice: conversation analytic perspectives (45-85). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawa'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jacknick, C. (2013). "Cause the textbook says...": laughter and student challenges in the ESL classroom. Studies of laughter in interaction, 185-200.

Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2013). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. Applied Linguistics, 36(1), 73-94.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In. G. Lerner(ed.) Conversation analysis, studies form first generation (13-34). John Benjamins.

Jurafsky, D., Shriberg, L., & Biasca, D. (1997). Switchboard SWBD–DAMSL shallow discourse- function annotation coders manual, Draft 13. University of Colorado, Boulder, and +SRI International.

Kapellidi, C. (2015). The practice of (re) formulating in classroom interaction: Some preliminary remarks. Pragmatics and Society, 6(4), 565-592.

Kasper, G. (1997). "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. The Modern Language Journal, 81(3), 307-312.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 551-567.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, *19*(1). 83-99.

Kasper, G. & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition* (117-142). London: Routledge.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*, 171-212.

Kim, Y. (2009). The Korean discourse markers-untey and kuntey in native–nonnative conversation: an acquisitional perspective. Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives, 317-350.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Sage.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.) *The handbook of conversation analysis* (229-256). West Sussex: Blackwell.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(7), 1083-1110.

Kurri, K., & Wahlström, J. (2007). Reformulations of agentless talk in psychotherapy. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, *27*(3), 315-338.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends... *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 603-607.

Lee, Y. A., & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing Developmental Changes Through Conversation Analysis: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(4), 763-788.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the" semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics, 13, 238-276.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). An introduction to conversation analysis. London: Continuum.

Liebscher, G., & DAILEY–O'CAIN, J. E. N. N. I. F. E. R. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234-247.

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *71*, 98-116.

Long, M. H. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 318-323.

Long, M. H. (2006). Problems in SLA. Second Language Acquisition Research Series. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 10 Industrial Avenue, Mahwah, NJ 07430

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in second language acquisition, 19*(01), 37-66.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in second language acquisition, 20*(01), 51-81.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum

Markee, N. (2002). A conversation analytic perspective on quantification and generalizability in applied linguistics and SLA. In ILTA/AAAL Plenary Panel American Association of Applied Linguistics Annual Conference:(Re) Interpreting Applied Linguistics, Salt Lake City, UT, April (pp. 6-9).

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. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4). 491-500.

Markee, N. & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis? In N. Markee, (ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*, (425-439).

Markee, N. & Seo, M. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *IRAL 47*. 37-63.

Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 1(3), 193-207.

McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in society, 19*(3), 349-377

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Melander, H. & Sahlström, F. (2009). In tow of the blue whale: Learning as interactional changes in topical orientation. *Journal of Pragmatics 41*. 1519–1537.

Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 542-552.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 501-518.

Mori, J., & Markee, N. (2009). Language learning, cognition, and interactional practices: An introduction. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 1-9.

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 536-550.

Nabei, T., & Swain, M. (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness, 11*(1), 43-63.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language learning, 57*(4), 511-548.

Nguyen, H. t. (2006). Constructing "expertness": A novice pharmacist's development of interactional competence in patient consultations. *Communication and Medication*, *3*(2), 147–160.

Norrick, N. R. (1991). On the organization of corrective exchanges in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *16*(1), 59-83.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*. 1493-1512.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in second language acquisition, 17*(04), 459-481

Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning, 50*(1), 119-151.

Pallotti, G. (2001). External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi- party conversations. In A. Di Luzio, S. Guenthner, F. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture in communication* (295-334). Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Pallotti, G. (2002). Borrowing words. In J. Leather & J. van Dam (Eds.), *The ecology of language acquisition* (183-202). Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In

P.Seedhouse, S. Walsh & C. Jenks (eds.) *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (105-126). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pekarek Doehler, S. & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (206-243). Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Peräkylä, A. (2011). Validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction. *Qualitative research*, 365-382.

Perakyla, A. (2004). Reliability and Validity in Research Based on Naturally Occurring Social Interaction in Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice. (Silverman, D. ed.). *London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage*.

Peräkylä, A., & Vehvilƒinen, S. (2003). Conversation analysis and the professional stocks of interactional knowledge. *Discourse & Society*, *14*(6), 727-750.

Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior* (Vol. 24). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Potter, J. & te Molder, H. (2005). Talking cognition: Mapping and making the terrain. In H. te Molder and P. Potter (eds), *Conversation and cognition* (1–54). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Putting aspiration into words:'Laugh particles', managing descriptive trouble and modulating action. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(6), 1543-1555.

Reichert, T., & Liebscher, G. (2012). Positioning the expert: Word searches, expertise, and learning opportunities in peer interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(4), 599-609.

Rine, E. F. & Hall, J. K. (2011). Becoming the teacher: changing participant frameworks in international teaching assistant discourse. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (244-274). Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1967). The search for help: No one to turn to. E. Schneidman (Ed.), Essays in self - destruction (s. 203-223). New York: Science House.

Sacks, H. (1992). In G. Jefferson (Ed.), Lectures on Conversation (Vols. I and II).

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American anthropologist*, *70*(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). 'Third turn repair' in G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, and J. Baugh (eds): Towards a Social Science of Language 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 31–41.

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.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. Semiotica, 8(4), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. R. Resnick, J. M. Levine, and S. D. Teasley (eds), Socially shared cognition (150–71). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. (1979). Qualitative sociology. Simon and Schuster.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. Language Learning, 54(S1), 1-54.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and language learning. Language Teaching 38(4), 165-187

Seedhouse, P. (2007). On ethnomethodological CA and "linguistic CA": A reply to Hall. The Modern Language Journal, 91(4), 527-533.

Sert, O. (2011). A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms.

Sert, O. (2013a), 'Book review: Christopher Joseph Jenks, transcribing talk and interaction', Discourse Studies, 15(3), 353–5.

Sert, O. (2013b). 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. Journal of Pragmatics, 45(1). 13-28.

Sert, O. (2015). Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse. Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O. (2016). Active Listenership as an Indicator of L2 Interactional Competence: Insights from an "Oral Communication Skills" Course. Symposium on the Teaching and Testing of L2 Interactional Competence, 29 April – 1 May 2016, Rice University, Houston.

Sert, O. (2017a). Tracking an L2 Speaker's Use of Complementizer that in Discussion Tasks. Thinking, Doing, Learning Conference 2017. 19-21 April, 2017. Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich, Germany.

Sert, O. (2017b). The Interplay between Collaborative Sequences and Active Listenership: Implications for L2 Interactional Competence. 15th International Pragmatics Conference. 16-21 July, 2017. Belfast.

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language) 5(1). 1-14.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. Language and Education, 27(6), 542-565.

Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. Journal of Pragmatics, 77, 97-112.

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. Language Teaching Research, 10(4), 361-392.

Sidnell, J. (2010). Conversation analysis: An introduction. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford University Press.

Svennevig, J. (2013). Reformulation of questions with candidate answers. International Journal of Bilingualism, 17(2), 189-204.

Ten Have, P. (2007). Doing conversation analysis a practical guide 2nd edition. London, UK: Sage

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2010). Incidental microgenetic development in second-language teacher–learner talk-in-interaction. Classroom Discourse, 1(1), 66-81.

Van Lier, L. (2000). 11 From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. Sociocultural theory and second language learning, 245.

Waring, H. Z. (2002). Displaying substantive recipiency in seminar discussion. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35(4), 453-479.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). 'How was your weekend?': developing the interactional competence in managing routine inquiries. Language Awareness, 22(1), 1-16.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). Vygotsky and the social formation of mind. Harvard University Press.

Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. The Modern Language Journal, 86(2), 157-173.

Woods, D., & Fassnacht, C. (2010). Transana V242-B. Madison, WI: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. [Cited 23 Apr 2013]. Available from: URL: http://www. transana. org.

Wong, J. (1994). A conversation analytic approach to the study of repair in native-nonnative speaker English conversation: The element" yeah" in same turn repair and delayed next turn repair initiation (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles).

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. Applied linguistics, 21(2), 244-267.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token" yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33(1), 39-67.

Yagi, K. (2007). The development of interactional competence in a situated practice by Japanese learners of English as a Second language. Hawaii Pacific University TESL Working Papers Series 5. 19-38.

You, H. J. (2015). Reference to shared past events and memories. Journal of Pragmatics, 87, 238-250.

Young, R. F. (2000). Interactional competence and validity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Association for Applied Linguistics (Vancouver, Canada, March 2000).

Young, R. F. (2013). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. Iberica, 25. 15-38.

Young, R. F. & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. The Modern Language Journal, 88(4). 519-535.

Ziegler, G., Sert, O., & Durus, N. (2012). Student-initiated use of multilingual resources in English-language classroom interaction: next-turn management. Classroom Discourse, 3(2), 187-204.

Ziegler, G., Durus, N., & Sert, O. (2015). Analysing ELT in the European Arena: Multilingual Practices. In International Perspectives on ELT Classroom Interaction (pp. 188-207). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 3. JEFFERSON TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION

[ ]	Overlapping utterances – (beginning [) and (end])
=	Contiguous utterances (or continuation of the same turn)
(0.4)	Represent the tenths of a second between utterances
(.)	Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)
:	Elongation (more colons demonstrate longer stretches of sound)
.	Fall in pitch at the end of an utterance
-	An abrupt stop in articulation
?	Rising in pitch at utterance end (not necessarily a question)
CAPITAL	Loud/forte speech
__	Underline letters/words indicate accentuation
↑↓	Marked upstep/downstep in intonation
° °	Surrounds talk that is quieter
hhh	Exhalations
.hhh	Inhalations
he or ha	Laugh particle
(hhh)	Laughter within a word (can also represent audible aspirations)
> <	Surrounds talk that is spoken faster
< >	Surrounds talk that is spoken slower
(( ))	Analyst notes
( )	Approximations of what is heard
$ $	Surrounds 'smile' voice

Adapted from Jenks (2011)