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Abstract

The present work aims at contributing to classical SLA planning research by developing a behavioral respecification of planning. To this end, I adopt a process-oriented, conversation analytic approach in the analysis of thirteen planning sessions, conducted by four groups of adult learners of Italian as a foreign language while preparing for a classroom presentation in their L2.

In general terms, planning is defined as a goal-oriented activity that is carried out to prepare for the performance of a given task. Classical SLA research conceptualizes planning in psycholinguistic terms, as an individual, cognitive endeavor, and studies it with a product-oriented approach, focusing on the linguistic gains that can be obtained in the final performance of a task, given different planning conditions (e.g., planning time, guided versus unguided planning, group versus individual planning, etc.). However, this line of research has generally failed to document what learners actually do during planning, and has fundamentally disregarded the social aspects of planning and task performance (Ellis, 2005a).

Thus, in line with the call for a process-oriented and ecologically sound approach to planning in SLA (Donato, 1994; Ellis, 2005a; Foster & Skehan, 1999; Kawauchi, 2005; Ortega, 1999, 2005; Sangarun, 2005; Truong & Storch, 2007), and with the behavioral approach adopted in other fields (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Roth, 1996, Suchman, 1987, 2007), the present work applies a behavioral and process-oriented approach to the study of group planning, as it is collaboratively accomplished, in situ, by the participants.

In my analysis, I rely on the methodological and theoretical tools of ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (CA), which affords an emic (i.e., participant-related) account of what actually happens in the process of group planning, on a moment-by-moment basis. Specifically, I use CA to demonstrably document: (a) the observable practices enacted by students during
planning; (b) the students’ use of available resources; (c) the creation of material artifacts (both oral and written) that reflect the gradual emergence of the planning product in interaction; (d) the students’ emic criteria in carrying out the planning activity and in conceptualizing the final task.

In analyzing the present dataset, I explore how students collaboratively create and work on emergent linguistic artifacts, mainly consisting of script lines to be performed in the L2 during the final presentation. Specifically, I focus on those artifacts that emerge orally, get shaped in and through the interaction, and are finally written up in Italian. These artifacts function as public conversational substrates (Goodwin, 2013), upon which various operations are performed. Such operations include translations from the L1 to L2 and vice versa, and repair work targeting accuracy and comprehensibility. An analysis of the language alternation patterns enacted by these students also shows how the participants, regardless of their proficiency level in the L2, resourcefully employ the two shared languages in their repertoire (i.e., L1 English and L2 Italian) and co-construct a local interactional order (Cromdal, 2005) where the alternation between the L1 and the L2 embodies the distinction between planning process (typically conducted in English) and planning product (typically conveyed in Italian). Overall, these findings speak to the distinction between task-as-plan and task-as-activity (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Hellermann & Pekarek Doeleher, 2010; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002; Seedhouse, 2005b), by showing how students are “active agents” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496) who accomplish the task according to their ongoing interpretations of the task itself and of the instructional setting in which it takes place.

In conclusion, the analysis developed in this study allows for a behavioral respecification of planning, which comes to be defined as an intersubjective, goal-oriented activity that is done by multilingual actors as observable behavior, in situ, in and through embodied talk-in-
interaction. Planning is thus achieved through the lamination (Goodwin, 2013) of different semiotic systems and embodied interactional practices, while planning sessions represent particular loci of emergent, accumulative, and cooperative human action where specific language learning behaviors (Markee, 2008) may be expected to occur.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Broadly speaking, planning can be defined as a goal-oriented activity that is carried out to prepare for the performance of a given task. Traditionally, planning within the classical\(^1\) tradition of second language acquisition (SLA) studies has been conceptualized as an individual, cognitive endeavor. However, my dissertation will focus on group planning as a socially situated activity (i.e., as an activity that is strongly oriented to the local circumstances of action; see Suchman, 2007), collaboratively accomplished by adult learners of Italian as a foreign language while preparing for a classroom presentation in their L2.

1.1 Objectives and significance of the study

The significance of this project lies in the distinctive contribution that a process-oriented, behavioral – not behaviorist\(^2\) – approach can give to planning research in SLA. Such an approach, which relies on the methodological and theoretical tools of ethnomethodological conversation analysis (CA) affords a moment-by-moment account of what actually happens in the process of group planning, thereby showing how planning is collaboratively achieved, in situ, on a moment-by-moment basis.

This behavioral approach – which is quite novel in SLA planning research (see also Markee & Kunitz, 2013) – has already been fruitfully adopted in diverse research areas; e.g., interface design in human-machine interaction (Suchman, 1987, 2007),

---

\(^1\) Following Markee & Kunitz (2013), I will use the expression classical SLA versus mainstream SLA to denote psycholinguistic approaches to second language learning. At the moment, in fact, what is mainstream and what is not in SLA is not clear (see Swain & Deters, 2007). For example,

\(^2\) While it is true that CA shares Behaviorism’s interest in observable behavior, it is completely agnostic regarding the value of the central tenets of Behaviorism; i.e., stimulus-response theory and operant conditioning. Thus a careful distinction between these two terms is due. Failure to do so may lead to serious epistemological error (see Bachman, 2006 for an example of such a misinterpretation).
interaction among architects (Murphy, 2004, 2005), and learning-through-design among children (Roth, 1996). The behavioral account of students’ planning practices that my dissertation will provide contributes to our understanding of how group planning is collaboratively done as a situated activity, and extends the body of research conducted so far to another type of interactions; i.e., interactions-for-classroom-tasks. In the case of the language classroom, the products of these interactions are typically linguistic artifacts, either in oral or in written form.

In his studies, Murphy (2004, 2005) focuses on a crucial component of group planning: collaborative *imagining*; i.e., an ideational, goal-oriented, situated activity, accomplished through the collaborative effort of coparticipants, who use a variety of semiotic resources (e.g., talk, gestures, and drawings in the interaction among architects) to create material artifacts that capture the unfolding design trajectory. This activity is monitored with close CA analyses documenting the meaningful intersection of semiotic resources while emergent artifacts are collaboratively shaped by coparticipants. Similarly, Suchman (2007: 20) claims that, in order to understand the *in situ* generation of plans and their relations with products, researchers should give “an account of the relation between planning-as-activity, the artifacts of that activity, and the subsequent activities to which those artifacts (conceptual, linguistic, or otherwise) are meaningfully related” (p. 20). Research efforts of this kind fall within the broader endeavor of describing human cognition and action (Goodwin, 2000a, 2011, 2013; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011) as situated in “real-world cognitive ecologies” (Hutchins, 2006, p. 390) where individual cognition interacts with a variety of resources (including artifacts, tools, and other people) to accomplish social actions. The present study constitutes an
early attempt to see how these ideas might play out in the context of socially situated SLA studies in general, and in the application of CA to the field of second language studies\(^3\) in particular (see, among others: Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Markee, 2011; Markee & Kasper, 2004).

More specifically, I propose to respond to a recent call by Rod Ellis to broaden the cognitive, experimental, and product-oriented paradigm that is currently dominant in the study of pre-task strategic planning in SLA (Ellis, 2005a, p. vii-viii). Within this paradigm, planning is conceived as a psycholinguistic, individual construct that is implicated in every instance of spoken and written language use (Ellis, 2005b, p. 3)\(^4\), and which affects students’ task performance in the L2. Such a conceptualization of planning as a solitary phenomenon has inspired a number of experimental studies (Ellis, 1987; Crookes, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996, 1999; Mehnert, 1998; Ortega, 1999; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Ellis, 2005a) that have contributed to our understanding of the effects of planning on learners’ gains in complexity, accuracy and fluency. However, as Ellis (2005a, p. vii-viii) himself admits, these studies have for the most part disregarded the social aspects of planning and task performance, and have generally failed to: 1) document what learners actually do during planning; and 2) show whether learners do what they intended to do in their planning work. Hence Ellis (2005a) acknowledges the need to broaden the paradigm, in order to explore the planning *processes*, not just the planning *products*.

\(^3\) I deliberately avoid the term “CA-for-SLA” in order to avoid the issue of what the A in SLA stands for (Kasper, 1997) and of whether A-as-acquisition falls within the scope of CA. For a recent critique on the use of this term see Wong (2013).

\(^4\) This view of planning was inspired by Levelt’s (1989) model of L1 speech production, subsequently adapted to L2 production by De Bot (1992). See Chapter 2, section 2.1.2.
To be fair, some cognitively oriented researchers (Kawauchi, 2005; Ortega, 2005; Sangarun, 2005) have attempted to investigate the processes implicated in solitary planning. However, the research tools commonly used in this kind of research (retrospective interviews, questionnaires, plan-aloud reports, collection of students’ notes) have been criticized because of their questionable reliability (Foster & Skehan, 1999; Truong & Storch, 2007). Even more fundamentally, Skehan and Foster (2005) have gone so far as to claim that solitary planning is an “unobservable activity” (p. 197). In other words, there are no research tools that can provide direct evidence of planning and “the claims that are made are on the basis of inference only” (Skehan & Foster, 2005, p. 197). Therefore, they conclude, solitary planning can only be studied as a construct; i.e., as “a working hypothesis or concept” (see the definition of construct on: www.merriam-webster.com).

In contrast, my study invokes the importance of focusing on group planning as an ecologically valid area of empirical investigation (Foster & Skehan, 1999; Ortega, 1999; Truong & Storch, 2007). In fact it allows for direct observation of the actual practices and learning behaviors enacted by learners and is indeed frequently implemented in language classrooms. To date only two studies (Donato, 1994; Truong & Storch, 2007), framed within the sociocultural theory of learning (Lantolf, 2006, 2011; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007), have looked at group planning with a process-oriented approach. I contend that the limitations of these studies can be traced to the fact that they have not explored the planning process within a behavioral, conversation analytic approach (see Chapter 2, sections 2.1.5 and 2.1.6).
With the present work I therefore intend to demonstrate that a behavioral, process-oriented, CA approach is the best suited to respond to Ellis’ (2005a) call for broadening the paradigm in SLA planning research. Such an approach – strongly anchored in the sequential details of the unfolding interaction – can in fact demonstrably document, on a moment-by-moment basis: (a) the observable practices enacted by students (e.g., the use of hypothetical discourse; individual and collaborative repair sequences, including searches; L1/L2 alternation practices); (b) the students’ use of available resources (e.g., their own knowledge of English and Italian, dictionaries, online sources of information, computers, paper, pencil, and erasers); (c) the creation of material artifacts (both oral and written) that reflect the gradual emergence of the planning product in interaction; (d) the students’ emic criteria (e.g., accuracy, comprehensibility) in carrying out the planning activity and in conceptualizing the final task.

Overall, the analysis shows how the students’ multimodal interactions integrate talk, various embodied actions such as eye gaze, pointing and bodily postures, tools and emergent cultural artifacts into a unified, discursive whole through which planning is conducted as a socially situated activity. The dissertation documents how students use the resources at their disposal (including the languages in their repertoire) to organize their planning work and to negotiate their epistemic stances on the matters at hand. Ultimately, planning sessions prove to be loci of laminated and cooperative human action (Goodwin, 2013), in which specific language learning behaviors may regularly be expected to occur.

This study is framed within the “process-oriented reconceptualization effort” (Ortega, 2011, p. 170) that has characterized the social turn in SLA since the late 1990s,
when Firth and Wagner (1997) published a breakthrough critique of the classical SLA paradigm (a criticism that started in the late 1970s; see: Watson-Gegeo, 2004, p. 332). The findings resulting from this type of research should be of interest to conversation analysts concerned with the application of CA to the study of learning behaviors in task-based student-student interactions, as manifested in situ in real time. Furthermore, while contributing to a social and behavioral respecification of planning in the field of second language studies, these findings may also engage cognitivist, product-oriented researchers in a useful, albeit challenging, dialogue. Such a dialogue could potentially allow to overcome the long-standing “dichotomous thinking” (Ortega, 2011, p. 170) between cognitivist and social-oriented approaches to the study of language learning.

Finally, my dissertation findings will also be of interest for anthropologists, ethnographers, and education scholars concerned with gaining a better understanding of learning behaviors as a nexus of situated phenomena that constitute a crucial aspect of human action.

Lastly, in line with the idea that doing applied CA means providing a “description leading to informed action” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 224), this descriptive study of the students’ planning practices will invite pedagogical reflections about: (a) the variable relationship between the task as planned by the teacher and the students’ interpretation of it (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002; Seedhouse, 2005a); (b) the teacher’s intervention during the planning process; (c) the feasibility of including a process component in the current product-based assessment procedures. Overall, such reflections, informed by an
empirical account of what students actually do during planning, can lead to a reconsideration of the pedagogical practices commonly adopted in the classroom.

1.2 Methodology: Conversation Analysis (CA)

The dissertation relies on the methodological tools afforded by CA to the study of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction, a term used to indicate the general “conduct of conversation” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 207) and the courses of action that participants pursue when they are engaged either in ordinary conversation or in institutional talk. Talk-in-interaction is considered as “the primary, fundamental embodiment of sociality” (Schegloff, 2006a, p. 70). Thus CA, defined as a “naturalistic observational discipline” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 289), aims at developing rigorously empirical analyses of the mechanisms that organize talk-in-interaction in a methodical and orderly manner. CA thus adopts a qualitative methodology, rooted in the hermeneutic scientific tradition (Markee, 1994, p. 90), whose purpose lies in describing and interpreting how natural phenomena are organized “in terms of lay participants’ real-time understanding” (Markee, 1994, p. 93).

CA originated in the early 1960s through the collaboration of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. It is the most well known offshoot of ethnomethodology (EM; see Garfinkel, 1967), a form of sociology that focuses on everyday common-sense activities, and on how participants themselves make sense of those activities (Button, 1991; Francis & Hester, 2004; Heritage, 1984a; Markee, 2011; Markee & Seo, 2009; ten Have, 2004). Specifically, EM aims at describing how participants construct their everyday experiences by using ordinary language and it represents “an attempt to make the world investigable in the participants’ own terms”
This attention to the participants’ perspective is crucial for conversation analysts. They in fact adopt an *emic* (i.e., participant-relevant) perspective, which shows how members observably orient to each others’ talk as a resource for interpreting what actions are being accomplished on a moment-by-moment basis, given the specific sequential position that each turn at talk occupies. In other words, talk functions as its own local context (Markee, 2013. See also: Drew & Heritage, 1992; Markee, 2011; Maynard, 2003). From this perspective, the meaning of each turn at talk is interactionally interpretable in terms of the talk that immediately precedes it and that which immediately follows. It is in this sense that talk is said to be both *context-shaped* and *context-renewing* (Heritage, 1988).

Considerations about the exogenous (i.e, talk-external) context (e.g., sociocultural factors such as nationality, gender, issues of native versus non-native ‘speakerness’, etc.), then, are *not* included in the analysis *unless* the participants themselves observably talk these factors into relevance during their talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1987, 1991). Put another way, the analysts’ categorization of a conversational setting must be grounded in the relevancies that are made apparent by the coparticipants’ “displayed orientation” (Schegloff, 1993, p. 101) and are thus “internal to the setting” itself (Schegloff, 1987, p. 219). To identify these internal relevancies, analysts must carefully examine the participants’ conduct. In fact, “in an interaction’s moment-to-moment development, the parties, singly and together, select and display in their conduct which of the indefinitely many aspects of context they are making relevant, or are invoking, for the immediate moment” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 219). Consequently, the participants’ orientations are to be
treated “as local and sequential accomplishments that must be grounded in empirically observable conversational conduct” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495).

At the same time, the adoption of an emic perspective implies that CA is not theory-driven in the traditional etic (i.e., researcher-oriented) sense. That is, CA researchers use *unmotivated looking* (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970), not a priori theory, as their analytic point of departure into the data. The premise is that “no aspect of the data can be dismissed as ‘uninteresting’ a priori” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 122; see also Heritage, 1984a). Specifically, conversation analysts do not use pre-existing theoretical concepts (such as etic psycholinguistic notions of planning derived from cognitive SLA) to analyze a particular course of action. Rather, theory (i.e., an emic, participant relevant version of theory) is considered to be “a by-product of empirical analysis” (Markee, 2008, p. 405; emphasis added). In short, it is in this sense that CA is said to be ethnomethodologically indifferent (Psathas, 1995) to etic theories and to be agnostic as to their usefulness in its domain of inquiry.

Hence, the adoption of an emic perspective requires conversation analysts to rely on the same resources that the participants themselves observably use to make sense of each other’s talk-as-action, or “talk-that-doess” (Schegloff, 1990, p. 52), on a moment-by-moment basis. These resources include observable sets of practices, such as turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2000a), repair (Schegloff, 1979, 1992, 1997, 2000b; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), conversational sequencing (Schegloff, 2007), and the preference organization of talk (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). All of these practices are part of the “machinery” of talk-interaction (Sacks, 1995, v.2, p. 169), through which talk is performed as orderly activity, courses of
action are undertaken and accomplished, and mutual understanding is co-constructed and maintained by the interactants. CA scholars thus aim at “understanding analytically what action is” by describing how “people use language and concomitant forms of conduct to do things” (Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002, p. 5).

Now, since the analytical object of inquiry is naturally occurring talk-in-interaction, the primary data in CA are audio and video recordings of people interacting with each other. As Golato (2003) observes, “the strength of CA lies in the fact that its methodology allows for the repeated and detailed analysis of utterances in their sequential context” (p. 95). The data are made available for analysis through transcripts, which, although highly detailed, are nonetheless selective (and therefore incomplete) renderings of what actually goes on in the interaction. In CA, transcripts reflect the first analytical effort on the researchers’ part.

Clearly, the availability of video recordings has been crucial in adding a further element to the analysis: by looking at video data, analysts can observe and describe the participants’ nonverbal conduct, from eye gaze to hand gestures and bodily postures. Studies including a description of the participants’ nonverbal behavior and of their spatial arrangements (see for example: Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 2007a, 2007b; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2005; LeBaron & Streeck, 1997; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Olsher, 2004; Schegloff, 1984; Seo & Koshik, 2010; Streeck, 1993, 1994; Streeck et al., 2011) have demonstrated how the participants’ embodied actions are crucial for an accurate, emic interpretation of the interaction. In fact, “participants’ nonverbal behaviors and talk contextualize each other on a moment-by-moment basis in naturally occurring interaction and […] they are
methodically coordinated, shaping and being shaped by specific sequential contexts” (Seo & Koshik, 2010, p. 2220).

In recent years, CA has been applied to the study of interaction in language learning environments, such as classrooms (e.g., Hellermann & Cole, 2009; Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Markee, 1994, 2008, 2011; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002, 2004; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Seedhouse, 2004, 2005a, 2005b), one-to-one writing conferences (Koshik, 2002; Young & Miller, 2004), tutor-tutee encounters (Markee & Seo, 2009; Seo & Koshik, 2010) and the like. The goal of these studies is to examine how language learning environments are interactionally organized and “how participants accomplish socially distributed cognition as behavior” (Markee, 2008, p. 405. See also, among others: Kasper, 2008; Schegloff, 1989, 2006a, 2006b; te Molder & Potter, 2005). As Seedhouse (2005b) puts it, if CA studies of learning environments aim “to understand the relationship between interaction and the process of language learning, it is vital to understand how the interaction is organised” (p. 172).

The advantage of a CA approach to the study of language learning environments is that CA affords a moment-by-moment monitoring of the interaction, so that interactional practices, learning behaviors and learning objects can be tracked in the moment and over time (Markee, 2008, 2011). When applied to an investigation of group planning sessions, CA can document and give an emic account of the way the planning activity is achieved on a moment-by-moment basis.

---

5 Note, however, that these two authors are not committed to ethnomethodological CA, although they use its methodological tool set. For further discussion, see Markee (2008).

6 For a discussion of socially distributed cognition in CA applied to the field of second language studies, see Chapter 2, section 2.2.6.
1.3 The conversation analytic approach to L2 learning and use

From a theoretical point of view, this dissertation is framed within the CA approach to the study of second language learning and use (see: Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doelher, 2011; Kasper, 2004, 2006; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Marke, 1994, 2000, 2008, 2011; Marke & Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2002, 2004, 2007; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Schegloff et al., 2002; Seedhouse, 2004, 2005b). Such an approach is grounded in the reconceptualization of SLA suggested by Firth and Wagner’s (1997) seminal paper, where they argued for: (i) the importance of the social (i.e., contextual and interactional) aspects of language use and language learning; (ii) the adoption of an “emic (i.e., participant-relevant) sensitivity” (p. 286) to the study of second language learning and use; (iii) a reconsideration of the mainstream view that had prioritized “the individual-as-‘nonnative speaker’/‘learner’ over the participant-as-language-‘user’ in interaction” (p. 286).

Within this redefined perspective on the study of L2 learning and use – a perspective which has had a crucial impact on subsequent research in SLA (Atkinson, 2011; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Kasper, 2004, 2006; Lafford, 2007; Lantolf & Johnson, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2004; Marke & Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Mori, 2007; Ortega, 2011; Swain & Deters, 2007; Tarone, 2007) – L2 users are viewed as interactionally competent participants, who use the linguistic resources at their disposal as semiotic tools to socially construct meaning in context. This view then challenges some “monolithic elements” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 285) that are unproblematically employed in classical SLA, including the conceptualization of learners as deficient communicators who rely on interlanguage as a form of underdeveloped communicative competence, and category terms such as nonnative speakers and native speakers (which
imply homogeneity within each group and clear cut distinctions between them). Such elements are rooted in a characterization of the native speaker as an omniscient figure (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 291) who is endowed with a constant and fully developed monolingual competence. This vision, however, does not take into account the reality of our contemporary multilingual world and, most importantly, it considers nonnative speakers/learners and native speakers as fixed, deterministic identities that are constantly relevant. However, CA analyses of encounters between L1-users and L2-users (see for example: Hosoda, 2006; Kasper, 2004; Kurhila, 2001, 2005) demonstrate how there is a constant shift in the identities to which the participants orient, turn by turn, and how the distinction between native speaker and nonnative speaker is relevant only at distinct moments in the interaction. To put it in Kasper and Wagner’s (2011) words: “the identities’ local relevance is subject to the parties’ interactional projects at any given moment in their talk” (p. 121). Therefore, an emic perspective on the data is crucial to describe the emic relevance of the social identities as they are locally constituted (Schegloff et al., 2002) by the participants’ orientation on a moment-by-moment basis.

At the same time, CA practitioners criticize the use of dichotomies such as language versus communication, competence versus performance. Language, in fact, is not considered as a crystallized, stable, a priori system separated from communicative situations; on the contrary, language constitutes “a dynamic set of resources” (Mori, 2007, p. 850) that the participants deploy, interpret and manipulate to perform social actions through interaction (Schegloff et al., 2002; Seedhouse, 2005b). This view of language as a dynamic resource serving interactional purposes is indeed in line with the
new characterization of L2 learners as effective users of the linguistic means at their disposal.

Moreover, rejecting the language versus communication dichotomy (see Sfard, 1998) leads us to reject another crucial dichotomy in classical SLA; i.e., the dichotomy between acquisition and use (see: Gass, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997). In a CA perspective, in fact, acquisition and use are inseparable (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496), since it is in and through interaction that a language is learned: acquisition happens through use. Learning, then, is respecified as an activity that is “situated in social practice and social interaction” (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 807; emphasis added7) and (psycholinguistic) learning processes are respecified as a nexus of (observable) learning behaviors that are displayed in the intersubjective space between interactants (Markee & Kasper, 2004).

Such a reconceptualization of learning in socio-interactional and behavioral terms implies a redefinition of communicative competence as a set of interactional competencies, that are situated (Schegloff et al., 2002, p. 13) and co-constructed (Seedhouse, 2005b, p. 172) through participation in talk-in-interaction. As Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004) observe:

If interactional activities are the fundamental organizational tissue of learners’ experience, then their competence cannot be defined in purely individual terms as a series of potentialities located in the mind/brain of a lone individual, but needs

---

7 In a CA perspective, learning is always situated, whether a researcher integrates CA with other theories (i.e., the theory of situated learning) or relies on CA as its only theoretical and methodological framework. For a discussion of these issues, see below and Chapter 2, section 2.2.5.
to be conceived of as a plurality of capacities embedded and recognized in the context of particular activities. (pp. 502-503)

Moreover, interactional competencies represent both a resource for and the object of learning (Kasper, 2006, p. 87). Learners in fact use their available interactional competence (i.e., their knowledge of “the microstructure of interactional language”: Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496) to engage in interactional activities through which further competencies can be developed (Kasper & Wagner, 2011).

Now, CA may well be used to study language learning behaviors and to describe how learning processes are publicly displayed and accomplished (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). However, CA does not provide its practitioners with a theory of learning; that is “a theory of how interactional competence is acquired and how it develops over time” (Kasper, 2006, p. 91). Thus, researchers have fundamentally two solutions (Kasper, 2006; Markee, 2008): (a) linking CA with compatible learning theories; (b) exploring and extending CA’s analytical potential in describing learning as socially distributed. Further discussion on these matters will be presented in Chapter 2 (section 2.2.6). For now, suffice it to say that I situate my study within the line of research that relies on CA as its exclusive methodological and theoretical framework, by adopting a strictly emic and behavioral perspective (see: Kasper, 2004; Lee, 2010; Markee, 1994, 2000, 2008, 2011; Markee & Seo, 2009; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Mori, 2002, 2004; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009). This research agenda prescribes that learning is studied “in and as the members’ phenomena” (Lee, 2010, p. 409), as a social activity accomplished in the contingent engagement of interaction, in moments when the parties “recognizably and accountably ‘do’ learning” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 127) and orient to its relevance. An emic
account of learning as social practice should thus “describe how participants themselves, in and through their interaction, co-construct what the object of learning is for them” (Mori & Hasegawa, 2009, p. 66), how they orient to it, how they present it and how they negotiate it. This ‘purist’ version of CA research aims to “recover the sense-making practices through which the object of learning is discovered and acted on” (Lee, 2010, p. 404). And since learning is done in and through interaction, it is crucial to analyze the details of the unfolding interaction.

Finally, a word about the use of Learning Behavior Tracking – a CA-based methodology elaborated by Markee (2008, 2011) – that will be used: (a) to track the moment-by-moment creation and development of collaboratively written artifacts; and (b) to document the practices enacted by the participants in the process of shaping the emergent artifacts.

1.4 Organization of the dissertation
The dissertation is organized as follows. Chapter 2 provides a review of the lines of research and the studies that constitute the theoretical framework and the rationale for the present work. I thus review how planning has been conceptualized in psycholinguistics and in classical SLA research, before describing what a behavioral perspective on planning entails (section 2.1). I then turn to an overview of the concept of situated cognition and how its development has been influential on studies of human action in general and of learning in particular (section 2.2); the notion of situated cognition is at the root of the behavioral respecification of planning that I adopt here. Then, since the participants in my study engage in task planning, the findings of CA analyses of task-based instruction are relevant and will be reported in section 2.3. Finally, I outline three
perspectives on language alternation and codeswitching (CS) as enacted by L2 users (section 2.4). These include the multilingual/ecological perspective, the cognitive perspective, and the interactional perspective. Chapter 3 is devoted to a description of the study: the procedure of data collection and a description of the pedagogical practices and presentation requirements that were adopted in the setting where data were collected.

Chapter 4 explores how students collaboratively create and work on emergent artifacts, while Chapter 5 presents an emic account of the practices of language alternation and CS performed by the students during their planning sessions. Finally, the last chapter discusses the main findings of the present study and its relevance; there I also address some pedagogical implications and mention a few directions for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Planning

2.1.1 Planning: introducing the phenomenon

Planning is a ubiquitous human activity and is also the object of study of various disciplines. As part of our daily experiences, planning has a broad, common-sense definition: it is a goal-oriented activity that is carried out to prepare the performance of a given task. As shown in Figures 2.1-2.4, a simple Google search for images on planning shows pictures and charts mainly (but not exclusively) related to the business world.

Figure 2.1 Financial planning
Figure 2.2 Planning a short film
Figure 2.3 Strategic business planning
Figure 2.4 Coordinated teamwork

8 http://www.mediabistro.com/agencyspy/files/original/article_financial_planning.jpg
In these images planning is portrayed as a key activity in business (possibly more important than the plan itself), and is represented as a process aimed at a specific direction or goal, typically involving (coordinated) teamwork in a given work-place (i.e., a construction site, a business meeting, etc.). At any rate, no matter whether planning is represented as an individual or as a group endeavor, the images suggest that it often involves the use of tools (i.e., computers, calculators, scissors, pens, paper, boards, etc.).

On the other hand, there is also a range of narrower discipline-specific definitions of planning, which reflect the theoretical perspectives of the different research fields within which planning is being investigated. Here, I am concerned with the definition and the operationalization of planning in linguistics and, more specifically, in SLA.

In the following sections I will introduce planning as it has been defined in linguistics; specifically, in psycholinguistic models of L1 and L2 speech production. I will then discuss the theoretical interest that classical SLA research has shown for these models and I will illustrate the distinction between different types of planning in this research strand. Since the object of my research is pre-task strategic planning, I will briefly summarize previous findings about the effects of this type of planning on task performance. I will then discuss different lines of planning research that have emerged, mostly within the classical SLA framework itself; i.e., one investigating planning as a process, the other focusing on group (versus solitary) planning. Finally, I will develop a critique of planning studies conducted so far and discuss how a behavioral, process-oriented, conversation analytic approach may contribute to our understanding of planning as a socially situated activity.

11 http://info.cncstrategy.com/blog-0/bid/52610/Why-Does-Strategic-Planning-Fail-to-Work
2.1.2 Planning in psycholinguistics

In psycholinguistics, the most influential theory of planning has been developed by Levelt (1989), in his cognitive model of L1 speech production. According to this theory, planning is involved in every instance of language use (Ellis, 2005b, p. 3). Specifically, Levelt describes the psycholinguistic process that regulates the oral production of an utterance. This process is incremental and is articulated in three phases: (a) the conceptualization of a preverbal message, (b) the formulation of a speech plan (i.e., internal speech), and (c) the articulation of the message through actual speech. Each phase is regulated by a specific module: (a) a conceptualizer, (b) a formulator, and (c) an articulator. Each module is a specialized system that receives a particular kind of input and generates a particular kind of output.

What follows is a brief description of Levelt’s model. The conceptualizer is the message generation component, where two main phases of the process take place: (i) the macroplanning of communicative goals, and (ii) the microplanning of specific information that needs to be conveyed to achieve those goals. The output of the conceptualizer – the preverbal message – constitutes, in turn, the input for the formulator, which uses the semantic/conceptual information contained in the preverbal message to activate lemmas (with their semantic and syntactic information) and to select the relevant lexemes (i.e., morpho-phonological forms). In other words, the formulator is in charge of the grammatical and phonological encoding of the message; the output is a speech plan, which is converted into actual speech by the articulator. At this point, overt speech goes through the audition module which produces a phonetic string entering the speech-

---

12 Similar models for written production have also been formulated (e.g., Kellog, 1996), but will not be reviewed here.
comprehension system; here, speech is parsed and fed into the monitoring component of
the conceptualizer. This component is crucial in that it keeps track of the unfolding
discourse record of a conversation, allowing the speaker to monitor her own production
and that of the interlocutor.

Clearly, in such a model the focus is on the individual speaker and planning is
intended as a psycholinguistic process carried out by a single individual. But Levelt
(1989) also emphasizes that “the most primordial and universal setting for speech is
conversational, free interaction between two or more interlocutors” (p. 29). In other
words, the components regulating individual speech production must allow the speaker to
converse; i.e., to use language in a highly contextualized form, attuned to the “participant
context” and to the “spatio-temporal setting” of the interaction (Levelt, 1989, p. 29). To
illustrate this point, Levelt quotes important CA studies (e.g.: Goodwin, 1981; Sacks et
al., 1974; Schegloff, 1972, 1987; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), focusing on the issues of
recipient design and turn-taking (specifically in terms of the projectivity of utterances and
of the discourse type, or speech-exchange system, in use). These issues relate to the CA
perspective on planning as a moment-by-moment activity that shapes the on-going talk to
achieve a particular goal at a particular moment in a particular conversation with a
particular recipient (Markee, 2000, p. 40).

This emphasis on the speaker-as-conversationalist, together with the references to
CA work, disappears in De Bot’s (1992) adaptation of Levelt’s (1989) model to L2
speech production. De Bot’s main goal, in fact, is that of creating a model that is able to
explain the peculiar phenomena characterizing the speech production of balanced and
non-balanced bilinguals. These phenomena are: code-switching, cross-linguistic
Influence, relative speed of production, differences in proficiency between the L1 and the L2, number of languages being spoken.

In De Bot’s (1992) adaptation, the macroplanning function of the conceptualizer is considered to be language-general, but the microplanning function is conceived as language-specific, since each language is supposed to have its own conceptual system. At the same time, the formulator may store lemmas and lexemes of the two languages separately or together, depending on the linguistic distance between the two languages and on the speaker’s proficiency level. If the languages are distant and the proficiency level in the L2 is low, then the speaker will rely on two different formulators. Finally, the articulator is the same for the two languages, which explains the cross-linguistic influence of the L1 on the L2. Overall, according to De Bot (1992), the main difference between L1 and L2 speech production lies in the reliance on automatic versus controlled processing during the formulation and the articulation of a message. That is, especially at low proficiency levels, a message in the L2 is formulated and articulated under controlled processing, whereas in L1 production these stages are deemed to be automatic.

2.1.3 Planning in classical SLA research

The classical SLA research paradigm in the study of planning is experimental and cognitivist, and has mainly focused on planning as an individual construct. Such research aims at investigating the effect of planning on learners’ production by measuring whether planning improves the learners’ fluency, accuracy, and/or complexity during task performance (Ellis, 2005a, 2005b, 2009; Skehan, 2009). It is thus the planning products that constitute the object of investigation in classical SLA studies on planning.
Hence, given the interest of classical SLA research for the effect of planning on production, the models describing the psycholinguistic processes regulating speech production (i.e., Levelt’s model and its adaptation to L2 speech production by De Bot, 1992 and, more recently, by Kormos, 2006) are at the core of the discussion in this research strand (Ellis, 2005b, 2009; Skehan, 2009). Specifically, (i) such models afford the formulation of precise hypotheses regarding the nature of variability in learners’ production and the impact of particular operationalizations of planning on speech production; at the same time, (ii) the validity of models of speaking can be tested through experiments that manipulate a given set of variables in the planning condition. The basic theoretical assumption behind this research is that different types of planning assist different production processes and can therefore be predicted to ease the pressure on working memory (Ellis, 2005b, 2009) in different stages of production.

Ellis (2005b, 2009) distinguishes between two main types of planning: pre-task and within-task planning. Pre-task planning is done before the actual task performance: learners may rehearse a task before the actual performance (what Ellis calls rehearsal) or they may be given time before the performance of a given task in order to discuss the content and the language to be used in that task (i.e., strategic planning). On the other hand, within-task planning occurs online, during task performance, and is further divided into pressured versus unpressured, depending on whether learners are given a limited versus an unlimited amount of time to perform the task.

As Ellis (2005b, p. 14) suggests, a number of hypotheses can be formulated about the effect of different types of planning on the various stages of production. First of all, rehearsal may be expected to aid all three components in Levelt’s (1989) model; i.e.,
conceptualization, formulation, and articulation. And indeed, experimental research on
this type of planning (Bygate, 1996, 2001; Gass, Mackey, Fernandez, & Alvarez-Torres,
1999) has confirmed that the repetition of the same task can improve the learners’
performance, though mostly for fluency and complexity. At the same time, unpressured
within-task planning may be predicted to impact the formulation stage together with the
monitoring process, thereby aiding accuracy; a prediction that has been confirmed, at
least for the accuracy of rule-based forms (Ellis, 1987; Hulstijn & Hulstijn, 1984; Yuan &
Ellis, 2003).

As for pre-task strategic planning, it is expected to assist conceptualization, thus
increasing complexity and fostering fluency. Overall, previous studies (Foster, 1996;
Foster & Skehan, 1996, 1999; Gilabert, 2007; Kawauchi, 2005; Mehnert, 1998; Ortega,
1999; Sangarun, 2005; Skehan & Foster, 1997, 2005; Tajima, 2003; Wendel, 1997; Yuan
& Ellis, 2003) have confirmed this prediction, both for foreign and second language
learners, but mainly in terms of fluency, in both of its dimensions: temporal (i.e., number
of syllables per minute), and repair (i.e., false starts, repetitions, reformulations). Less
consistent results have been found for complexity and accuracy. This may have to do
with a range of possible intervening factors (i.e., proficiency, the learners’ attitude
towards planning, the level of task complexity, the presence of instructions guiding
learners during planning time). A trade-off effect may also be involved (Skehan, 1996;
Ellis, 2009) due to the learners’ limited processing capacity, so that a gain in complexity
is achieved at the expenses of accuracy and vice versa. Moreover, another factor that
should be taken into account is that, although focusing on form during planning, learners
might have difficulties in carrying over the form they have planned into actual task performance (Ellis, 2005b, p. 24).

Overall, researchers in this area agree that more studies need to be conducted and that, in order to obtain more consistent and comparable results, some important issues need to be addressed (Ellis, 2005b, 2009). For example, the studies conducted so far have different operational definitions of fluency, accuracy and complexity; moreover, studies on pre-task planning do not control for online planning during task performance and do not document whether learners use all the planning time at their disposal.

Nonetheless, as Skehan (2009, p. 527) points out, classical SLA planning research has reached at least three broad conclusions: (i) complexity (both at the syntactic and the lexical level), accuracy, and fluency are crucial dimensions of second language performance; (ii) trade-off effects can account for the mixed results obtained for accuracy and complexity; and (iii) Levelt’s model is a useful theoretical framework to investigate learners’ performance. Specifically, experimental tasks can be manipulated so that planning is operationalized as having four types of influences on the different stages of Levelt’s model: complexification (i.e., the level of task complexity), pressuring, easing, and focusing, with complexification linking mainly to the conceptualization phase (and therefore to the structural and lexical complexity of the preverbal message), and pressuring, easing, and focusing influencing formulation (and thus the accuracy and fluency manifested in the expression of the message).

2.1.4 Classical SLA planning studies with a process element

Besides the need to address the issues mentioned above, SLA planning research has been called to respond to a serious critique raised by one of its main practitioners: Rod Ellis
(2005a, 2009). This scholar, in fact, points out one crucial limitation of the classical experimental paradigm; namely, that – being product-oriented – it has not considered what learners actually do during planning time. How do they use the time at their disposal? In the case of guided planning, do they follow instructions or do they resort to strategies and resources other than the ones suggested in the instructions? In Ellis’s (2009) words: “It cannot be taken for granted that learners do actually plan (either strategically or on-line) when given time to do so, especially if they do not see the planning time as useful” (p. 505). Moreover, most studies to date have not demonstrated whether learners in task performance actually carry out what they had planned. At the same time, by considering planning as a solitary phenomenon, the classical product-oriented, cognitive approach has failed to recognize the social dimension of planning and task-performance (Ellis, 2005a, p. viii). Hence, in 2005 Ellis called for a broadening of the paradigm, in order to include a process-element and to acknowledge the social dimension of planning and task-performance.

In what follows I will provide a brief review of the few studies that incorporated a process-element in their analysis of the effects of solitary pre-task strategic planning on task performance. The methodological tools used to investigate how the planning process is carried out mainly consist of retrospective interviews (Wendel, 1997; Ortega, 1995, 1999, 2005; Sangarun, 2005) and questionnaires (Kawauchi, 2005). According to Ortega (2005), in fact, retrospective data are the most suited to include “the view from the learner” (p. 78) and to document the processes in which students engage during strategic planning. Retrospective data are thus considered a crucial tool that allows
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13 See for example Tajima’s (2003) study, which reported positive effects for planning only with learners who had a positive attitude toward planning time.
researchers: (a) to verify whether participants actually engage in the expected planning behaviors, and (b) to articulate the full range of behaviors that planning may actually foster. In addition, Sangarun (2005) decided to complement retrospective data with plan-aloud reports.

In her studies, Ortega (1995, 1999, 2005) conducted retrospective semi-structured interviews aiming to elicit “metacognitive responses that provided insight into cognitive processes associated with speakers’ strategic planning of the tasks” (Ortega, 2005, p. 82). In order to stimulate the students’ accurate recall, during the interviews the researcher made use of the students’ notes and of her own field notes, taken while observing the learners’ overt behaviors during planning.

The participants in Ortega’s studies were 44 college level students, enrolled in fourth and fifth semester courses of Spanish in the US. They were engaged in a narrative task. The input for the story was provided by a strip of pictures and by a recorded L1 version of the story; the students were then given ten minutes of unguided planning time before telling the story to their partner. During planning time, they were allowed to take notes, but they could not use the notes during the story retelling task.

The participants’ responses were coded by combining two types of categorization: (a) the analysis of emergent themes, and (b) the application of a priori categories of learner strategies developed by other researchers. This last categorization aimed at relating the cognitive operations described by the students to SLA theories of pre-task strategic planning (Ortega, 2005, p. 83).

During the interviews, the students mentioned the benefits of having extra time and of being allowed to take notes. Specifically, they reported using the allotted extra
time to collect and organize their thoughts, to engage in lexical searches, and to identify language problems in advance. On the other hand, the possibility of taking notes was reported to support rehearsal operations, while also allowing the students to expand their lexical choices, to focus on grammar, and to make their story more complex. Overall, then, the most frequently reported strategies were retrieval and rehearsal operations, which were explicitly recognized by learners as beneficial for task performance.

In general, the students in Ortega’s studies (1995, 1999, 2005) focused both on content (i.e., meaning) and on form, while the presence of a listener raised issues of comprehensibility that led to listener sensitive choices in both content and form. Specifically, the students reported organizing the content in listener sensitive ways, opting for simple vocabulary and aiming for fluency, while they focused on the accuracy of forms considered essential for the listener’s understanding. Overall, the learners seemed to pay attention to form-meaning connections, a result that Ortega (2005) takes as evidence that pre-task strategic planning “fosters learners’ attention to language as a meaning-making tool” (p. 107).

Interestingly, though, attention to form was reported also for less meaningful/communicative structures, a finding that Ortega (2005, p. 104) relates to the foreign language context, where pedagogical practice often emphasizes the explicit learning of morphosyntax. Moreover, Buckwalter (2001) also argues that strong-morphology languages like Spanish, Italian, and Japanese, may require more attention to morphosyntax than weak-morphology languages like English. This interpretation may explain why Ortega (2005) and other researchers (Buckwalter, 2001; Iwashita, 2001;
Pellettieri, 2000) found heightened attention to morphosyntax in task-based FL contexts where the L2 was a strong-morphology language.

Note that this finding mirrors Wendel’s (1997) findings on 40 Japanese learners of English (i.e., a weak-morphology language), enrolled in a junior college. These students were also engaged in a narrative task and had ten minutes of unguided planning time with the possibility of note taking. They all reported the use of a focus-on-content strategy; i.e., sequencing narrative events in chronological order during planning. On the other hand, only three students declared that they focused on grammar, but stated that it did not help much during task performance. On the basis of these responses, Wendel concluded that a focus on grammar during planning time is not useful (Ellis, 2005b, p. 20).

This, however, seems a somewhat drastic conclusion, given the number of intervening factors that may cause the learners to focus more on meaning than on form and vice versa. In fact, besides the issues of the SL versus FL context and of the strong versus weak morphology language being studied, individual differences – as Ellis (2009) argues – may play a decisive role in terms of how planning is conducted and perceived. This interpretation is indeed supported by the participants’ responses analyzed by Ortega (2005, p. 87). First of all, she found important differences regarding the learners’ orientation to accuracy versus communication: the accuracy-oriented students – i.e., the students who reported a frequent focus on form – also had a positive attitude towards planning time, which, conversely, was negatively perceived by the communication-oriented students, who were more meaning-oriented. At the same time, differential language expertise may affect the planning strategies reported by the students: learners at
a more advanced level reported a more balanced use of retrieval and rehearsal operations and a more frequent recourse to monitoring strategies; these learners are also the ones who benefited the most from planning in terms of accuracy.\textsuperscript{14}

In Sangaruń’s (2005) study, focus on meaning and focus on form were manipulated at the outset by the researcher. In fact, the participants (40 Thai high school students of EFL at the intermediate level) were given fifteen minutes of guided planning time during which they were instructed to either focus on meaning, focus on form, or focus on meaning and form, in preparation for two monologic tasks (i.e., an instruction task and an argumentative task). The instructions (described in Sangaruń, 2005, pp. 119-122) were based on principles developed following Levelt’s (1989) model of speech production; the main idea is that a focus on meaning during planning reduces the processing load of the conceptualizer during task performance, while a focus on form affects the formulator. During planning time, the students were allowed to take notes, but they were not supposed to write in detail what they wanted to say and they could not use their notes during task performance. During planning the participants were also engaged in plan-aloud reports and were interviewed by the researcher after the performance of the task.

Sangaruń’s (2005, p. 112) goals were: (i) to identify the strategic planning processes resulting from a focus on meaning, from a focus on form, and from a focus on meaning and form; (ii) to investigate whether these three foci have an effect on the learners’ application of their plans; and (iii) to examine the effects of the three foci on speech production.

\textsuperscript{14} Positive effects on fluency and syntactic complexity were found for all students, while the low-intermediate students are the ones who improved the most in lexical complexity.
Sangarun’s findings are as follows. First, the use of three types of strategies was reported. Specifically, strategies related to: (a) setting the communicative goal (e.g., elaborating on task instructions, evaluating and reconsidering the communicative goal); (b) planning meaning (e.g., generating ideas, organizing discourse, revising and rehearsing ideas); and (c) planning form (e.g., selecting lexical items, applying syntactic rules, revising and rehearsing language). In any case, irrespective of the planning foci, the learners reported focusing mainly on meaning during planning time.

Second, the specific planning focus did not affect the subsequent application of planned content and form to task performance. Third, all the planning conditions had a positive effect on fluency in the two tasks and on accuracy in the argumentative task. Sangarun (2005, p. 13) attributed this last result to the effectiveness of the planning instructions, which led to a reduction of the processing load on the conceptualizer and/or the formulator, thereby freeing more attentional resource for monitoring accuracy.

Importantly, Sangarun (2005, p. 132) recognized two main limitations to her study. First of all, the findings may not be generalizable to performance in dialogic tasks. Then, a methodological issue: some cognitive steps may have occurred too quickly for the participants to be able to register them in speech in the plan-aloud protocols.

Last, Kawauchi (2005) conducted her study on Japanese university students of EFL (16 low-intermediate, 12 high-intermediate) and ESL (11 advanced students). They all had to perform a monologic, narrative task under three different planning conditions:

15 A positive effect for complexity was found only for students in the meaning-focused and meaning-and-form-focused planning conditions. Overall, greater benefits seem to derive from the meaning-and-form-focused planning condition.

16 The fact that the learners’ accuracy did not significantly improve in the easier instruction task is explained by a ceiling effect. Note also that Sangarun (2005) attributes the inconsistent findings for accuracy in the literature on strategic planning to the lack of effective instructions.
in the first condition they had to write a narrative (to be told orally during task performance); in the second condition they had to rehearse the narrative orally; in the third condition they read a model narrative.

To collect information about what students did during planning time, Kawauchi used retrospective data, collected via a questionnaire administered to the participants right after the planning phase and before task performance. The questionnaire consisted of questions about the degree of attention to language and the usefulness of the planning activity; for each question, the participants had to choose from a seven point Likert scale.

Interestingly, the type of planning was not found to have a significant effect on speech production,\(^{17}\) even though a qualitative analysis indicated an increase in the use of low frequency lexical items and problematic structural items, especially after reading a model narrative. The learners who benefited the most from this activity were the low EFL learners and this finding is confirmed by their responses to the questionnaire: they reported paying the most attention to vocabulary after being engaged in reading and graded reading as the most useful planning activity.

Overall, the studies reviewed in this section adopted a process-product approach, aimed at considering all the variables (Ortega, 2005, p. 108) that may intervene during the planning process and therefore affect task performance. Retrospective data and plan-aloud reports give us insights about the learners’ orientations (to planning, to accuracy, to communication) and about “what learners *say* they do when they plan” (Ortega, 2005, p. 77; emphasis added). In general, during strategic planning the students seem to prioritize content/meaning, while also attending to form, at least to some extent. This is interpreted

---

\(^{17}\) An effect was however found for proficiency: learners in the high EFL group benefited the most in terms of fluency and complexity, while learners in the low EFL group benefited the most in terms of accuracy. For an interpretation of these results see Kawauchi (2005, p. 162).
as evidence that learners are more concerned with creating a conceptual plan rather than with formulating a detailed linguistic plan for their future task performance (Ellis, 2005b, p. 23). Sangarun’s (2005, p. 129) study, however, suggests that – even though the learners report focusing more on meaning than on form – they perform the task better (i.e., with a better speech quality) if they are guided to balance their attention between meaning and form. This observation has a pedagogical implication: when engaged in strategic planning, the learners should be instructed to focus both on meaning and on form. At the same time, Kawauchi’s (2005) study indicates that the type of planning activity may contribute to directing the learners’ attention to different aspects of their performance.

2.1.5 Studies on group planning

All the studies outlined above investigated solitary planning within the classical SLA research paradigm. However, it is from within this very same theoretical framework that a critique of solitary planning has emerged. Specifically, Foster and Skehan (1999, pp. 222-223) observed how the study of solitary planning may raise issues of: (i) ecological validity, and (ii) methodology.

As far as ecological validity is concerned, solitary planning is not the only method used in language classrooms; on the contrary, group planning may actually be more frequently implemented in classrooms and would thus be a more naturalistic condition to investigate (see also: Ortega, 1999, pp. 135-136). Moreover, besides being more ecologically valid, a study on group planning would be more in line with the premise of communicative language teaching that interaction facilitates SLA (Gass, 2003; Gass & Mackey, 2006; Long, 1996; Swain, 1995), and with the findings on the effectiveness of

On the other hand, Foster and Skehan (1999, pp. 222-223; 2005, p. 197) pointed out that the methodological tools used to investigate solitary planning are not adequate because the object of investigation itself is “an unobservable activity”. In other words, since researchers cannot directly observe individual cognitive activities, they can only hypothesize what happens during solitary planning; i.e., researchers are bound to assume (rather than observe and empirically prove) that, during individual planning time, learners engage in activities that affect task performance. Ultimately, researchers may well examine the notes taken by students during planning sessions, but still these artifacts do not represent mental processes in and of themselves.

Foster and Skehan (1999) then set up a study to investigate the source of planning, in order to compare solitary planning with two conditions that may be more frequent in the language classroom: group and teacher-led planning. At the same time, they also decided to consider the planning focus, operationalized as different instructions used to direct students to focus on meaning or on form. They predicted that, in teacher-led planning, the use of time would be more efficient, thereby leading to better performance.

The participants in Foster and Skehan’s (1999) study were 66 intermediate EFL students in the UK; they had to perform a decision-making task (i.e., the balloon debate) during regular class time. There were 6 planning conditions: two for group planning (form-focused and content-focused), two for teacher-led planning (form-focused and
content-focused), one for solitary unguided planning, and one for no planning; each condition was assigned to an intact class.

The students in the form-focused group planning condition were instructed to discuss the best language they could use to defend themselves, to write down their ideas (taking notes not to be used during task performance), and to check the accuracy of the language they were planning to produce. On the other hand, the instructions received by the participants in the form-focused teacher-led planning were more specific: the teacher led a language-focused session on modal verbs and conditionals, with examples of what a doctor could say not to be thrown out of a balloon.

As for the content-focused conditions, students in the group planning condition were assigned a character to defend, so that they could collectively discuss ideas to defend themselves; the groups were subsequently reconfigured in classic jigsaw style so that each new group would have a representative of each character on the balloon. At the same time, in the teacher-led planning condition the teacher gave a presentation on ideas that each character might use, and then encouraged the students’ contribution.

Foster and Skehan (1999) found that the students engaged in solitary planning were more fluent, and produced more complex language with longer turns. On the other hand, the students in the teacher-led planning conditions were more accurate, but they did well on the other measures too. As for the group planning conditions, their results were comparable to those of the no planning control group, which led Foster and Skehan (1999, p. 238) to state that whatever happened during group planning, it did not affect performance. Finally, no effect was found for planning focus: content-focused and form-focused instructions produced similar results.
Foster and Skehan (1999) thereby concluded that teacher-led planning fosters a more balanced performance, with no trade-off effects between accuracy and complexity. Thus, pedagogically speaking, there seems to be a role for the teacher in guiding the students’ planning process to better task performance. On the contrary, even though group planning may lead to “useful interaction in itself” (Foster & Skehan, 1999, p. 238), since the students have to interact in order to reach an agreement toward a common goal, nonetheless group planning “militates against efficient task planning” (Foster & Skehan, 1999, p. 238). The line of reasoning goes that the students use the time at their disposal to negotiate how to proceed; this in turn detracts from the available amount of time\(^{18}\) and ultimately leads to a lower performance (Foster & Skehan, 1999, p. 224). The researchers then wondered whether students might be trained in order to make more efficient use of planning time for a more successful performance.

Last, Foster and Skehan (1999) interpreted the finding of planning foci not affecting task performance as an indication that “the effects of planning are not simply attributable to whether subjects concentrate on one of these areas rather than another” (p. 239). This observation, however, assumes that the students in the form-focused and content-focused conditions followed the instructions and actually directed their attention to the intended foci. What if they did not? The problem is that we cannot answer this question unless we look at the process; i.e., at what students actually do during planning time. And this is certainly the main issue with Foster and Skehan’s (1999) study: they did not investigate the practices enacted by students during the planning process. Even in the case of group planning – which *is* an observable activity – the researchers just

\(^{18}\) This suggests that there may be an issue of quantity of time more than an issue of quality of planning practices in group planning. It is therefore somewhat surprising that Foster and Skehan did not set out to investigate the effects of group planning when students are given more time.
examined the students’ performance. Clearly, though, if one seeks to determine if and how the students’ planning practices may affect subsequent task performance, one needs to document what these practices are, at least in those conditions – like group planning – where the students’ practices are indeed observable.

Moving on now to process-oriented studies on group planning, only two such studies have been conducted to date: Donato (1994) and Truong & Storch (2007). Both of these studies, framed within the sociocultural theory of learning (Lantolf, 2006, 2011; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007), looked at the interaction among students and illustrated relevant examples through the analysis of the participants’ transcribed talk. Donato’s (1994) work starts off with a critique of the studies conducted within the framework of the Interaction Hypothesis (e.g., Long, 1985; Pica, 1987; Doughty & Pica, 1986; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgentahler, 1989). According to this hypothesis, the psycholinguistic rationale for classroom group work is based on the theory that negotiating meaning in order to receive comprehensible input and to produce comprehensible output facilitates L2 learning. At the core of research conducted within this perspective is the conduit metaphor of communication: the goal of two conversational partners is to send and receive messages that are linguistically coded. Accordingly – Donato (1994) observed – in studies based on this metaphor “individuals are coerced into engaging in communicative conduits” (p. 36), where the social setting is reduced to “an opportunity for ‘input crunching’” (p. 34). Donato thus takes issue with the view of L2 acquisition as a solitary process, the success of which depends solely on the individual ability to receive, analyze, and incorporate input, while the collaborative social nature of L2 learning is lost.
Instead, Donato adopted a view of learning as an intrinsically social phenomenon. He grounded his approach on the tenets of Activity Theory (Wertsch, 1979), according to which intra-individual knowledge develops after inter-individual knowledge; i.e., knowledge is internalized by the individual after it has been negotiated and co-constructed among individuals in a social setting. This brings the focus on the process of co-constructing knowledge, which is deemed to yield linguistic change among and within individuals during collaborative activities (Donato, 1994, p. 39).

Donato therefore set out to investigate how students co-construct learning experiences in the classroom and how these experiences may lead to L2 development. The participants in his study were 3 third semester college students of French in the US, who collaboratively planned an oral task during a one hour planning session. The students were given a scenario and, during the planning session, they were supposed to agree on a possible conclusion to be presented later to the class. The focus of their planning was not guided; they were only instructed not to write out a script and not to use their notes during the presentation. Basically, Donato (1994, p. 44) aimed to obtain data that could reveal the goals generated by the students themselves. To this end, he audiotaped their interaction and subsequently transcribed it. As it turns out, the learners spontaneously focused on form, displaying their concern for accuracy. The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.5 (Donato, 1994, p. 44) is an example.

FIGURE 2.5 – FORM-FOCUSED SCAFFOLDING

1 A: ... and then I’ll say... *tu as souvenu notre*
2 *anniversaire de mariage*... or should I say
3 *mon anniversaire?*
4 B: *tu as*
5 C: *tu as*
6 A: *tu as souvenu... you remembered?*
7 C: yea, but isn’t that reflexive? *tu t’as*
8 A: *ah, tu t’as souvenu.*
9 B: *oh, it’s tu es*
FIGURE 2.5 (cont.)


In this example, the students engage in collaborative scaffolding; i.e., they provide each other with support, specifically in the production of the reflexive form *tu t’es souvenu*. As Donato (1994, pp. 44-45) illustrated, each student contributes to the accurate formulation of the French verb form: A produces the correct past participle (*souvenu*, line 1), C suggests that the verb is reflexive and produces the correct reflexive pronoun (*tu t’as*, line 7), B repairs the auxiliary *as* with the accurate form *es* (line 9), and finally A produces the correct form (*tu t’es souvenu*, line 14). In conclusion, the learners act as sources of knowledge for each other and the final accurate form is the result of collaborative work. Importantly, Donato found that the outcomes of 24 out of 32 cases of form-focused scaffolding were recycled in the subsequent task performance by individual students: there was at least evidence for L2 acquisition in the short term.

Similarly, Truong and Storch (2007) sought to observe what actually happens during planning time and to investigate whether task performance benefits from group planning. They were also interested in the focus of planning; i.e., to see whether students spontaneously focused more on content or on form. To this end, they collected data from 22 EFL students from an intact class at a college in Hanoi, who were engaged in a regular class activity. The students were divided in 5 groups and were given 20 minutes of planning time to discuss and prepare a topic to be presented to the rest of the class later by two randomly selected participants. They were allowed to take notes, but could not use them during task performance. The researchers audiotaped and transcribed four
group planning sessions and collected the teacher’s observation notes. They then segmented each session into different types of episodes: idea units and language related episodes (LREs; see Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Idea units consist of one or more utterances, recognizable for intonation, pausing and syntax, where one idea (or topic) is expressed. On the other hand, LREs are groups of utterances dealing with language issues: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation. Let us look at two examples.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.6 (Truong & Storch, 2007, p. 110) shows how the researchers coded idea units.

FIGURE 2.6 – GROUP TALK WITH 5 IDEA UNITS

1 Tien: oh david beckham he’s very famous [idea 1]
2 and er can you tell me er the reason why you
3 like... like him...? [idea 2]
4 Tiep: maybe he’s very handsome?
5 Bach: yeah... [idea 3]
6 Tien: he plays very well
7 Bach: yeah [idea 4]
8 ((laugh)) he is really talent... [idea 5]

The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.7 (Truong & Storch, 2007, p. 114), on the other hand, shows an LRE where the students focused on vocabulary.19

FIGURE 2.7 – VOCABULARY-BASED LRE

1 Tong: i don’t think so i just like his his songs
2 because i think that his songs sometimes
3 they are very suitable for my...
4 Guang: mood, state...
5 Tong: yes, my mood.

Once they coded the planning talk for idea units and LREs, Truong and Storch (2007) monitored the presentations to see whether ideas and language forms that emerged during planning time were indeed used during task performance.

19 In CA terms, this looks like a collaborative word search: Tong interrupts her turn when a next-due element is not available (line 3). Guang provides a possible outcome of the word search with mood, state (line 4) and Tong accepts mood as a solution to her search (line 5).
The first finding of this study is that the students spent their planning time producing ideas; i.e., they focused on content more than form. And when they did focus on form, they were mostly concerned with vocabulary issues and – to a lesser extent – with pronunciation; no grammar-based LREs were found. The second finding indicates that over 50% of the idea units used in individual presentations originated in group planning; however, only the group who engaged in more LREs used some LRE items in the presentation.

Truong and Storch (2007, p. 120) interpreted these findings as follows: the students naturally focused on meaning since presentations are communicative and meaning-focused tasks. At the same time, the presentations were not graded: they were simply meant for oral practice. This may explain the apparent lack of concern for accuracy. Another factor may be proficiency: in their study, Truong and Storch found that the group who produced more LREs was indeed a mixed-proficiency group, where there was also evidence of scaffolding. Not only that: this group produced the highest number of turns and the shortest turns; in other words, their planning sessions were extremely interactive. Furthermore, the mixed-proficiency group benefited the most from planning, since it is the group with the highest percentage of ideas generated during planning and used in the presentation and with the highest number of LRE items found in individual performances.

Truong and Storch (2007) therefore concluded that: (a) students need to be guided in order to focus on form, especially if the activity is not graded; (b) overall, group planning is beneficial to task performance and should be practiced in the classroom; (c) mixed-proficiency groupings may provide greater opportunities for language learning.
In conclusion, the studies reviewed in this section show a concern for more ecologically valid planning conditions, specifically for group planning. The only study that did not report an effect of planning on task performance is the one by Foster and Skehan (1999), who however did not look at what students actually did during planning time. The other two studies, instead, audiotaped the students’ interactions and were able to demonstrate that at least part of what is planned – either ideas or forms – gets recycled in subsequent task performance.

2.1.6 Critique

As the review above illustrates, the studies in classical planning research that introduced a process component (Kawauchi, 2005; Ortega, 2005; Sangarun, 2005) mostly focused on solitary planning, which – as Foster and Skehan (1999; 2005) pointed out – is in fact an unobservable activity. So, no matter what the appropriateness of the methodological tools may be, the researchers can only make assumptions rather than empirical demonstrations about the effect of planning on task performance.

At the same time, if the goal is documenting (see for example: Ortega, 2005, p. 78) what learners actually do when they plan, retrospective measures (such as retrospective interviews and questionnaires) and plan-aloud protocols are not adequate, since they document what the learners say they do.\(^\text{20}\) Moreover, retrospective measures rely on retrospective introspection; i.e., on the students’ ability to recall what they did.

\(^{20}\) Note, however, how this is unproblematic for these researchers. See for example Ortega (2005): “I will explore the nature of the benefits afforded by pre-task planning through an examination of what learners say they do when they plan” (p. 77; emphasis added).
(Truong & Storch, 2007, p. 106), which raises issues of possible inaccuracy in reporting the practices in which the students claim to be engaged during planning time.  

On the other hand, as noticed by Sangarun (2005), plan-aloud protocols may not report all the practices enacted by the students, since some “cognitive processing steps” (p. 132) may have occurred too quickly for the participants to articulate them in speech. This observation also raises another issue: expecting students to articulate relevant cognitive processes occurring during planning time implies assuming that these processes occur at the conscious level. Whether it is so or not is a matter of empirical investigation. Finally, the other measure used in planning studies – i.e., students’ notes – may not actually represent the mental processes activated during planning time (Foster & Skehan, 1999, p. 222; Truong & Storch, 2007, p. 106).

Another issue with these studies, specifically with Ortega’s (2005, p. 83), is the reliance on etic categories: the students’ responses are coded according to a priori categories of learner strategies developed by other researchers in order to relate the cognitive operations reported by the students to SLA theories of pre-task planning. I contend, though, that superimposing a priori, researcher-oriented categories on the students’ responses actually runs counter the goal of including the learners’ view (Ortega, 2005, p. 78). To do so, in fact, one would have to adopt an emic (i.e., participant-oriented) perspective, in order to unveil the participants’ orientation to the task at hand.

Now, as noted by Foster and Skehan (1999) and Truong and Storch (2007), group planning is a more ecologically valid area of investigation. At the same time, though, a study on group planning presents another crucial advantage: it is directly observable as

---

21 For a critique of elicitation procedures in the study of discourse versus the advantages of using naturally occurring data analyzed through CA, see Golato (2003).
behavior, thus allowing for empirically grounded observations of the students’ practices. Moreover, the availability of recorded talk (and of the corresponding transcripts) allows the researcher to analyze the students’ naturally occurring talk-in-interaction with the same resources that the participants have at their disposal to make sense of each other’s talk on a moment-by-moment basis. This guarantees that an emic approach is adopted; i.e., that the learners’ own perspective lies at the core of the analysis, rather than a researcher’s interpretation that is filtered through superimposed, exogenous categories.

To date, Donato (1994) and Truong and Storch (2007) are the only researchers who have used transcripts of recorded conversations to analyze the process of group planning. However, they relied on a very basic transcription system that does not unveil all the complexities that a CA transcript can reveal about naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. Moreover, the interactions were audio recorded, not videotaped, and this too prevents access to some of the resources that the participants have at their disposal during planning time (such as embodied participation frameworks and the use of specific tools like computers). In short, the methodological tools used in these studies do not capture all the verbal and nonverbal observable behaviors enacted by the participants. Moreover, neither Donato nor Truong and Storch discussed the specific sequential environments where certain behaviors occur and how they are done as systematic practices. At the same time, no analysis of how the students’ notes emerge in the interaction is provided.

---

22 For instance, in CA terminology, the examples of LREs reported by Truong and Storch (2007) seem to be cases of repair (also in the form of word searches), either other-initiated or self-initiated. It would be interesting to see who initiates repair and when, and how the repair initiation may be related to issues of uneven distribution of knowledge. Now, Truong and Storch (2007) did mention issues of proficiency as having to do with the production of LREs, and the length and number of turns at talk. They also talked about the participatory structure of the groups, particularly about the moves performed by some students, who acted as leaders (note how one of these moves was precisely that of providing an outcome to a word search).
Furthermore, in their study Truong and Storch (2007) classified the students’ planning talk in idea units and LREs so as to investigate the students’ planning foci. However, in so doing, they did not consider: (a) how the planning process actually unfolds on a moment-by-moment basis; and (b) when and where in the interaction a certain planning focus becomes relevant for the students. My main objection to the researchers’ coding practice is that it is grounded on and reinforces a clear-cut distinction between focus on form and focus on content. In other words, by coding the talk in episodes and by presenting the episodes in isolation, Truong and Storch (2007) decontextualized the episodes and took them out of the interactional sequence in which they occurred. We therefore do not have access to the sequential unfolding context of the talk, we cannot answer the question why that focus now and, thus, the interface between a focus-on-form and a focus-on-content as it emerges in the students’ talk-in-interaction is masked. Interestingly, Truong and Storch (2007) themselves related the greater number of vocabulary-based LREs to a general orientation of the students toward the content of their presentation, but this observation is based on the assumption that “the focus on idea units (and meaning) is more lexically based” (p. 117), rather than being empirically grounded in the analysis of the talk itself.

With my study I therefore seek to investigate the planning process as it unfolds in real time and as a locally realized, socially situated activity that is achieved on a moment-by-moment basis in both its ideational and decisional components. To do so, I will analyze video recorded data with a CA methodology that is strongly committed to an observations, though, would be much more substantiated if they were grounded in the sequential context of the talk.
emic approach to data analysis. Clearly, this is not merely a methodological matter, but rather implies a respecification of what planning is (Markee & Kunitz, 2013).

2.1.7 A behavioral perspective on planning

As we have seen, classical SLA studies are based on a cognitivist definition of planning, based on psycholinguistic models of speaking (Levelt, 1989; DeBot, 1992). Hence, they investigate planning as a psycholinguistic phenomenon and construct it as an experimental condition operationalized through the manipulation of different variables (such as source of planning, amount of planning time, guided vs unguided planning, etc.). In contrast, in this dissertation, I adopt a behavioral definition of planning as a situated activity; i.e., as a goal-directed activity that is strongly oriented to the circumstances of action (Suchman, 1987, 2007) and that is constituted as a nexus of integrated semiotic systems and behavioral practices. Thus, from this perspective, planning is an “imaginative and discursive practice” through which discursive and material artifacts are produced (Suchman, 2007, p. 13).

As Suchman (2007) points out, the cognitive sciences have long considered plans as determinants of actions, assuming a cause-effect relation between plans and actions. Clearly, this is the perspective adopted in product-oriented studies of planning, which examine the product to infer that planning took place. On the contrary, a process-oriented approach to the study of planning relies on two basic tenets: (a) plans are inherently vague, orienting devices that project actions, but can never fully specify them, since the emergent implementation of actions is “contingent on the circumstantial and interactional particulars of actual situations” (Suchman, 2007, p. 183); and (b) planning
itself is “a form of culturally and historically situated activity, manifest in specific practices and associated artifacts” (Suchman, 2007, p. 187).

This behavioral definition of planning lies at the core of process-oriented studies conducted in diverse research areas: e.g., interface design in human-machine interaction (Suchman, 1987, 2007), interaction among architects (Murphy, 2004, 2005), and learning-through-design among children (Roth 1996). In their research on planning as situated activity, Murphy (2004, 2005) and Roth (1996) highlighted the distributed nature of planning as a process that is collaboratively achieved through interaction among planners, within a particular environment and its available resources. The progressive advance of this process is marked by the emergent production of material artifacts that embody both the latest version of the plan and its history, capturing the unfolding design trajectory in solid form. The nature of these artifacts depends on the institutional setting and on the goal of the task at hand: e.g., in architectural interactions artifacts are drawings (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Schmidt & Wagner, 2004), while children engaged in learning-through-design activities (Roth, 1996) create engineering projects consisting of towers and bridges, etc. Similarly, in language learning environments, the kind of artifacts that students produce depends on the final task: a presentation, for example, can lead to the production of notes, scripts, and power point slides.

In conclusion, I argue that the behavioral, conversation analytic approach to planning is the best suited to respond to Ellis’ (2005a) call for broadening the paradigm in SLA planning research. This approach, in fact, is empirically grounded in the observation of naturally occurring data that is videotaped and analyzed using the research tools provided by CA. As such, it affords a moment-by-moment documentation of what
actually happens in the planning process, thereby showing how planning is collaboratively achieved, in situ, on a moment-by-moment basis.

Specifically, I focus on group planning as a socially situated activity, done in real time through talk-in-interaction among groups of L2 learners engaged in the preparation of a classroom presentation. During planning, the participants use available resources (e.g., paper, dictionaries, online sources of information, their own knowledge) to collaboratively construct emergent artifacts (such as notes, scripts, and slides), some of which are transitory, while others are more permanent in nature. These artifacts – which function as substrates that are publicly accessible (Goodwin, 2013; see below, section 2.2.4) and upon which specific operations (e.g., translation, grammar/vocabulary work, etc.) are performed – constitute important mediating tools in the students’ work (Roth, 1996). Moreover, during planning various patterns of knowledge distribution emerge among the participants, who negotiate their epistemic stances (Kärkkäinen, 2003, 2006) in order to collectively achieve a higher epistemic status (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b). In other words, planning sessions are particular loci of emergent, accumulative, and cooperative human action (Goodwin, 2013) where specific language learning behaviors (Markee, 2008) occur.

2.2 Situated cognition and learning

2.2.1 Introduction

As I have already noted, my dissertation aims to explore planning as a socially situated activity (Suchman, 2007) that is achieved in real time, through the participants’ embodied talk-in-interaction, and through their engagement with the semiotic and material resources available in the interactional setting (Markee & Kunitz, 2013). At the core of
This behavioral, process-oriented approach to planning is a situated view of cognition that emphasizes how cognitive activity does not solely happen in the individual mind. On the contrary, cognitive activity relies on the input received from the body (i.e., mind is embodied), is grounded in the natural and social environment (i.e., mind is embedded), and extends beyond the individual (i.e., mind is extended). In this view, cognition, experience, and action are tightly interrelated.

This section is thus intended to give a concise introduction to the concept of situated cognition and its implications for CA studies focusing on second language learning. The section is organized as follows. I will first review the philosophical and scientific antecedents of situated cognition (subsection 2.2.2) and illustrate the three theses (i.e., the embodiment thesis, the embedding thesis, and the extension thesis) at the root of a situated view of cognition (subsection 2.2.3). I will then show how the analytical interest in situated cognition is tied to a broader interest in the study of human action (section 2.2.4) and in the study of learning as a specific form of human, situated activity that is grounded in interaction (subsection 2.2.5). Finally, I will briefly describe three discursive approaches to socially distributed cognition (i.e., ethnomethodology, discursive psychology, and conversation analysis), and I will conclude by discussing the principles of an ethnomethodological respecification of language learning as social practice.
2.2.2 Situated cognition: philosophical and scientific antecedents

The philosophical antecedents of situated cognition trace back to the early 20th century, with John Dewey, Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Ludwig Wittgenstein being key figures in this development.\textsuperscript{23}

According to Dewey (1859-1952), the organism can be defined only in relation to the environment where its physical life develops: the organism-environment is the basic unit of experience (Gallagher, 2009, p. 37). Consequently, experience is situated; i.e., it is biological (since it involves an organism in an environment) and social. At the same time, since mental and physical experiences cannot be separated, cognition cannot be defined as a relation between thinking in the mind and acting in the world. Rather, cognition is to be understood as a form of socially situated action.

Husserl (1859-1938), in turn, puts intersubjectivity at the core of human experience. Intersubjectivity is in fact the awareness of being in a world that we cohabit with others; it is through this awareness that we come to understand the world as an objective reality that is shared with others. In other words, intersubjectivity is the foundation of our being-in-the-world and is also the existential condition that makes communication and mutual understanding possible (Duranti, 2010).

Heidegger (1889-1976) then emphasizes the “basic ontological situatedness of the cognitive agent” (Gallagher, 2009, p. 40). That is, being situated structurally defines our being human and permeates our cognitive and pragmatic activities. Human existence is thereby in-the-world in such a way that “the world is primarily ready-to-hand” (Gallagher, 2009, p. 41), that is, ready to be manipulated. This implies that there are two different types of knowledge: theoretical knowledge consists of our awareness of objects

\textsuperscript{23} For this section I follow: Duranti (2010); Gallagher (2009).
in the world that are *present-at-hand*; whereas circumspection (in German: *Umsicht*) represents our awareness of *ready-to-hand* entities (i.e., entities that can be manipulated, that are in-order-to). In other words, circumspection is a type of knowledge that results from our being “pragmatically immersed in worldly contexts” (Gallagher, 2009, p. 39).

Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) adds temporality as a further dimension of the situated human existence: we are situated both in space and time. Our experience in the world is temporally structured and it is through our temporal situatedness that we can make sense of and act in the environment. Merleau-Ponty then addresses the concept of the extended mind, by claiming that intersubjectivity is intercorporeality: the other is ‘accessed’ through a direct interrelation or resonance between bodies and bodily behaviors at the level of perception.

Finally, Wittgenstein (1889-1951) elaborates on the concept of situatedness in relation to human communication and the use of language. Each instance of language use is similar to a game involving situation-specific rules; i.e., rules that are specified according to local circumstances. Meaning is generated in context, through the activities in which words are used in a specific context of social interaction between specific social actors: “the meaning of a word or statement depends on the linguistic community in which the word is used or on what exists or happens in the environment” (Gallagher, 2009, p. 46). Therefore, the meaning of a concept is neither fixed nor universal, and it is not stored as a mental representation in one’s head. Rather, our meaning-making ability (i.e., our ability to use concepts while following the rules of a specific language game) is

---

24 For these concepts, see also the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (www.iep.utm.edu/phenom/).
a practical and social skill, rooted in a form of cognition that relies on “commonsense know-how and context-specific knowledge” (Gallagher, 2009, p. 47).

In the scientific realm, situated cognition is related to systems thinking (von Bertalanffy, 1968) and to its application in various incarnations of systems theory. In systems thinking, “a system is viewed as a dynamic and complex whole, an organization, [...] located within an environment” (Clancey, 2009, p. 12). Thus, a system is to be studied holistically, in order to understand the causal relationships and the emergent processes that constitute it. Systems thinking embraces a ‘both-and’ perspective, according to which the components of a system create the whole and vice versa. If the dynamic and emergent interactions among the component parts are not linear, the whole is considered a complex system. In exploring a complex system, it is important to consider the history of transactions among its parts, since those transactions have changed both the parts themselves and the system environment as a whole.

In such a view, cognition is conceptualized as situated. That is, knowledge does not consist of “enumerable discrete elements” (Clancey, 2009, p. 15) such as propositions and rules, models of theoretical understanding and functional procedures, all located in the brain. Rather, knowledge – and memory, meaning, and life itself – are all “active, dynamic processes, existing only in interactive behaviors of cultural, social, biological, and physical environment systems” (Clancey, 2009, p. 28). Put another way, knowledge, memory, meaning, and life cannot be localized (i.e., kept within a definite locality); rather, they have to be contextualized.

In summary, following Clancey,

---

25 For this section I follow Clancey (2009).
26 See the definition of localize on the Merriam Webster online (www.merriam-webster.com).
27 Clancey (2009, p. 28) talks about contextualization as antilocalization.
situated can be understood as emphasizing the contextual, dynamic, systemic, nonlocalized aspects of the mind, mental operations, identity, organizational behavior, and so on. [...] Specifically, situated cognition views human knowledge not as final objective facts but as (1) arising conceptually (e.g., dynamically constructed, remembered, reinterpreted) and articulated within a social context (i.e., a context conceived with respect to social roles and norms); (2) varying within a population in specialized niches (areas of expertise); (3) socially reproduced (e.g., learning in communities of practice; Lave & Wenger, 1991); and (4) transformed by individuals and groups in processes of assimilation that are inevitably adapted and interpreted from unique perspectives (improvised in action, not simply transferred and applied). (p. 17).

2.2.3 Situated cognition: three theses

The situated perspective on cognition is grounded on three fundamental theses (Robbins & Aydede, 2009): (1) the embodiment thesis; (2) the embedding thesis; and (3) the extension thesis.

First of all, the embodiment thesis states that cognitive activity “depends on the sensorimotor brain, with or without direct bodily involvement” (Robbins & Aydede, 2009, p. 5). Motor processes are integral to perception and there is a sensorimotor aspect in our mental representation of objects (Smith & Conrey, 2009, pp. 457-458). It is through the body that sensory inputs are received and motor outputs are performed: thus, it is through the body that sensing and acting happen. Without them, cognition (or thought) is empty. Perception, thought, and action are “constitutively interdependent” (Robbins & Aydede, 2009, p. 4). In this view, in fact, the primary goal of cognitive
activity is action. The human mind did not evolve for abstract cognition, but “for the on-line control of behavior under the demands of survival” (Smith & Conrey, 2009, p. 456), under the needs of adaptive action.\textsuperscript{28} From a situated cognition perspective, both cognitive processing styles and mental representations are action oriented, “tuned to the effective and efficient control of action” (Smith & Conrey, 2009, p. 457).

Second, the embedding thesis posits that cognitive activity is embedded within a specific environment and exploits its structure. Specifically, cognitive work is off-loaded onto the environment, so that internal representations and processing can be kept to a minimum (Robbins and Aydede, 2009, p. 7). The off-loading work is done through epistemic actions\textsuperscript{29} that use the structure of the environment to look up relevant information, thereby allowing us to avoid complex mental operations in problem-solving situations. Available material and cultural resources are used to solve a problem as it arises in a specific, concrete setting, so that the problem “is resolved by reasoning in situation-specific ways” (Kirsh, 2009, p. 264). For example, when confronted with the task of packing her groceries in a bag, a buyer does not calculate the optimal placement of each item based on detailed internal models of the world. Instead, she sorts the items by categories such as heavy/fragile/intermediate, and then packs her groceries. In other words, “rather than attempt to mentally store and manipulate all the relevant details about a situation, we physically store and manipulate those details out in the world, in the very

\textsuperscript{28} As Streeck et al. (2011, p. 7) observe, cognitive scientists who study embodied cognition consider motion as the original function of the brain, since only mobile organisms have brains. Other functions must have evolved from this primary ability.

\textsuperscript{29} Kirsh (2006) defines epistemic actions as actions “intended to simplify computation, reduce error or increase precision” (p. 252). Pragmatic actions, on the other hand, are “intentional movements taken to bring a subject physically closer to its external goals” (p. 252). The distinction between epistemic and pragmatic actions, however, is not always clear-cut, since an action may have both pragmatic and epistemic components.
situation itself” (Wilson, 2002, p. 629). Note, then, how embedding and embodiment are intertwined: epistemic actions involve a direct, real-time engagement with the local physical environment (Robbins & Aydede, 2009, p. 7) and are therefore made possible by the individual’s sensorimotor capacities, such as vision, pattern recognition, and object manipulation.

Put another way, the concrete setting where a problem arises and its available local resources influence the way the problem is going to be represented, framed, and finally solved. As Kirsh (2009) maintains, the setting and its resources activate an interpretive framework that primes agents to look for and conceptualize features of their environment in activity-specific ways, biasing what they see as problematic and what they see as the natural or at-hand resources available to solve such problems. (p. 271).

Moreover, as Kirsh (2009, p. 270) observes, human beings live in constructed environments, constituted by layers of material, cultural artifacts such as measuring devices, tools of all sorts, calculators, etc., that can be used as scaffolds (or “mental aids”: Kirsh, 2009, p. 284) to solve everyday problems and perform everyday tasks. Therefore, problem-solving skills are tied to the ability of making effective use of these artifacts through relevant practices in “resource-heavy environments” (Kirsh, 2009, p. 286). As Goodwin (2000a) points out, human cognition is embedded in “historically shaped frameworks for action, instantiated in both material media and the systematic practices of a group performing the activities that constitute its lifeworld” (p. 1518).

At the same time, when humans are confronted with a problem, they typically generate a range of intermediate structures, either material (e.g., reminders, color-coded
notes, etc.) or mental (e.g., mental annotations, visual markers, etc.), that humans add to the environment in order to “enrich” their situations (Kirsh, 2009, p. 281) and simplify the process of problem solving. During this process, cues, constraints, affordances, and artifact ecologies are perceived, created, and changed so that they can be used as problem-aiding resources (Kirsh, 2009, p. 290). Simply put, human beings ‘think with things’: “the determinants and dynamics of cognition depend on properties of artifacts and the context of action” (Kirsh, 2009, p. 298) and “thinking is somehow tied up with the way we encounter and engage the world” (Kirsh, 2009, p. 300). In other words, cognition is not only situated, but also interactive and distributed: our thinking is distributed across internal and external representations or manipulables (Kirsh, 2009, p. 297) and cognition is shaped through this interaction.

And here is where the extension thesis comes in: situated cognition extends beyond the boundaries of the individual organism. Cognitive activity is in fact distributed across situations and features of the environment, and is socially shared among individuals: it is a public, social process (Goodwin, 2000a, p. 1491). As Robbins and Aydede (2009) put it, “the mind leaks out into the world” (p. 8). Cognitive activity is performed through information-processing loops that pass through the individual mind, the physical environment, and the social environment (Smith & Conrey, 2009, p. 461).

As Kirsh (2006, p. 258) argues, a study of distributed cognition is a study of coordination; i.e., of how all the elements in a system coordinate well enough so that the system can accomplish its tasks. Cognition as a situated activity (Streeck, 2011, p. 67) is carried out through the coordination of different representational media in a variety of functional cognitive systems, such as processes internal to the individual, the individual’s
coordination with a set of tools, and a group of individuals interacting with each other and with tools (Hutchins, 1995a, pp. 372-373). Clearly, then, a situated view of mind and cognition entails an ecological perspective: cognition – which is embodied, embedded, and extended – needs to be studied in the wild (Hutchins, 1995a), as a cultural process that emerges and is achieved through the complex interplay of mind, body, and the natural and social environment.

In this perspective, the privileged object of investigation are “real-world cognitive ecologies” (Hutchins, 2006, p. 390), containing a variety of cognitive resources (i.e., physical objects, cultural practices, and mental models) with which the individual mind interacts. A seminal study in this area is Hutchins’s (1995a) analysis of navigation, where he focuses on the distribution of cognitive processes among people, between people and technology, and across time, in order to examine “the development of the social and material context for thinking” (Hutchins, 2006, p. 380). Since the publication of Hutchin’s work, a line of studies on distributed cognition in the workspace has developed over the years. Some of the most significant contributions include: studies on the nature of professional vision in the work of archaeologists, oceanographers, geochemists, and airport technicians (Goodwin, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 2000b; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996); studies on flight deck cognition (Hutchins, 1995b; Hutchins & Klausen, 1996) and on an airport operations room as a shared workspace (Suchman, 1996); studies on human-computer interaction (Hollan, Hutchins, & Kirsh, 1999; Suchman, 1987, 2007); and studies on design (Murphy, 2004, 2005, 2011; Roth, 1996) which will be more extensively reviewed in Chapter 4. For now, suffice it to say
that all these studies share the same premises: cognition is a public, social activity that
should be investigated in the process of its making within a specific material context.

2.2.4 Situated cognition and the study of human action

The interest in analyzing situated cognition is tightly connected with a broader interest in
human action and how it is accomplished. A primordial site for the study of situated
cognition and action consists of events during which multiple participants carry out
courses of action in concert with each other within face-to-face human interaction
(Goodwin, 2000a, p. 1492; Streeck et al., 2011, p. 1). In these events, the participants use
talk and other embodied behaviors (such as gestures and bodily orientations) to perform
action, while attending to each other and to relevant phenomena in the surrounding
environment, which constitutes the setting for their activities. As Streeck et al. (2011, p.
3) point out, an analysis of the collaborative work carried out by participants in such
events can unveil the practices through which human actors achieve (elementary forms
of) social organization and order. At the same time, such an analysis can also provide
insights about the co-construction of mutual understanding\textsuperscript{30} through “embodied
interaction in the material world” (Streeck et al., 2011, p. 9), where processes of
meaning-making and action formation are enacted by exploiting all the sources of
meaning offered by the local interactional setting.

In this view, embodied interaction is inherently multimodal, or laminated
(Goodwin, 2013). That is to say, it is conducted through the integration of different

\textsuperscript{30} In the terminology adopted here, \textit{intersubjectivity} is used in Husserl’s sense (see Duranti,
2010): intersubjectivity is our awareness of being in a co-habited world and constitutes an
essential condition of our being-in-the-world (regardless of whether we have mutual
understanding with other human beings or not). \textit{Mutual understanding}, on the other hand, is
intended as a specific type of intersubjectivity that is made possible by the intersubjective nature
of human existence.
semiotic resources, including talk, eye gaze, the participants’ bodies, material contexts, and artifacts. During a particular course of action, the semiotic resources (or semiotic fields) attended to by participants are organized in a specific *contextual configuration* (Goodwin, 2000a, p. 1490), which changes over time as action unfolds. With time, in fact, new semiotic fields may be added and others may no longer be relevant.

To illustrate the complexity and the intertwinedness of the semiotic resources attended to by participants, let us analyze the fragment reproduced in Figure 1.8 below (Streeck et al., 2011, p. 1). Here a senior archaeologist, Ann, is working with Sue, a new graduate student. Specifically, Sue is outlining the shape of an archaeological feature that is visible in the color patterning of the dirt.

FIGURE 2.8 – ARCHAEOLOGISTS AT WORK

1 Ann: *Wha’ do you think* of; (0.9) of uh;

2 (1.0)

3 Sue: *Does it* kinda go around=

4 en come over around there

5 Ann: *hphh I think it’s-

---

31 I thank Charles Goodwin for sharing the original image with me.
If one were to consider talk alone, Ann’s turn in line 1 (what do you think of) is not syntactically complete, since the slot for a noun is syntactically projected by the use of the preposition of, but no noun is uttered. At the same time, Sue’s turns in lines 3-4 refer to entities (the it in does it kinda go around, and the there in en come over around there) that are not actually specified in the talk. These turns, however, are not treated as defective by the participants, who in fact use other resources to ensure mutual understanding. So, in line 1, the slot for a noun is filled by a pointing gesture indicating a patch of color patterning in the dirt (see the first frame grab); Sue then displays her understanding of Ann’s action by moving her hand and trowel in the same spot indicated by Ann (see the second frame grab) and it is to this patch of dirt that Sue’s it refers in line 3. At the same time, the there in line 4 can be properly understood only in relation to the area of dirt that Sue is indicating with her gesture in the third frame grab. At the basis of the participants’ work-related, mutual understanding is their common orientation to a specific area of dirt as a shared focus of attention and action. Such an orientation is publicly displayed by the participants’ bodily postures: their bodies in fact create a particular participation framework,32 within which grammatically incomplete turns are understood and deictic expressions are grounded.

A close look at this simple interaction thus reveals the variety of semiotic fields attended to by participants to make sense of each other’s embodied actions. The participants in fact use talk, eye gaze, pointing and other gestures, artifacts, their bodily orientations, and particular features in the material environment as resources to understand each other in order to conduct a work-related activity. By itself, each set of semiotic resources is partial and is not sufficient to ensure mutual understanding and the

32 See also: Goodwin & Goodwin (2004); Goodwin (2007b).
progressivity of action. It is only through the integration and the mutual elaboration of the resources in the local contextual configuration that mutual understanding is ensured and locally relevant action can be performed.

The example in Figure 2.8 is thus a good illustration of the *laminated structure of action* discussed by Goodwin (2013): human action is composed of layers of different kinds of semiotic materials. These materials – arranged and shaped by the current action in a specific semiotic landscape – constitute the substrate for new, subsequent action. A substrate thus becomes a *cooperative transformation zone* that is acted upon by participants through a series of systematic operations. In Goodwin’s (2013) words: “Action uses as its input the structure and resources of a current substrate and produces as its output a new, transformed substrate that will constitute the point of departure for the next action, etc.” (p.17). That is, actions are produced through an accumulative, combinatorial process of *cooperative semiosis* (Goodwin, 2011) through which actors “systematically incorporate structure and meaning built by others into the interior organization of their own action” (Goodwin, 2013, p. 15). The organization of human action is thereby intrinsically cooperative, emerging “within interactively sustained contextual configurations […] that link both diverse signs and differently positioned participants into common courses of action” (Goodwin, 2011, p. 182). The construction of current action therefore builds upon structure and meaning provided by others with a process of continuous, progressive transformation. Finally, the organization of human action is also distributed since it encompasses the interaction among different participants and the interaction between diverse sign phenomena that mutually elaborate each other (Goodwin, 2011, pp. 183-184).
2.2.5 Situated cognition and situated learning

A situated view of cognition implies a situated (or situative) view of learning. At the root of this view is the basic notion that “learning is a way of being in the world, not a way of coming to know about it” (Hanks, 1991, p. 24). Such a notion can then be further articulated in a few crucial principles: (a) learning is an active process (i.e., knowledge is not passively received and stored, but actively built up by the cognizing subject); (b) learning and behaving are inseparable (i.e., learning is action); (c) understanding requires experience and the mediation of artifacts (including language) and tools; (d) learning happens through “a dynamic interplay between individual and social levels” (Wilson & Meyers, 2000, p. 71); (e) the function of cognition – and therefore of learning as a cognitive activity – is adaptive and thereby “serves the organization of the experiential world, not the discovery of ontological reality” (Clancey, 2009, p. 20).

What emerges from this view is a conceptualization of learning as always situated in a specific context, where the individual relates to the social and natural environment. Ultimately, learning emerges in and through the interaction of the individual with other people and with the surrounding environment. All these elements – the individual, other social actors, the environment with its technological artifacts – constitute an activity system, where “knowledge is contributed and used in joint actions by the people and other resources that participate collaboratively” (Sawyer & Greeno, 2009, p. 348).

---

33 Constructionism has influenced situated views of learning in important ways. For a discussion of the contribution of constructionism to situated learning/pedagogy see Clancey (2009). For a discussion of possible applications of situativity learning theory to the design of actual learning environments see: Barab & Duffy (2012); Bell & Winn (2000); Hill (2012); Hoadley (2012); Wilson & Myers (2000).
Learning is thus defined as *active participation* in an activity system and as changes in participation itself.\(^{34}\)

The focus of situated learning research, then, is on “situated action within activity systems” (Sawyer & Greeno, 2009, p. 350). Initially, in the early stages of situative learning studies, central issues were: (i) the distinction between formal and informal learning environments (Greenfield & Lave, 1982); (ii) the definition of apprenticeship (whether traditional or cognitive) as the (informal) alternative to formal schooling;\(^{35}\) and (iii) the notion of *legitimate peripheral participation* as a central feature of learning in general, whatever the form of education may be (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 40).

The notion of legitimate peripheral participation was proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) “as a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral constituent” (p. 35). What this notion emphasizes is that the matrix for learning is provided by the novice’s and the expert’s “common ability to coparticipate” (Hanks, 1991, p. 21), in such a way that the novice can improve her performance and her participation in the activity system, which is conceptualized as a community of practice.\(^{36}\)

Through such a process novices move from a peripheral to a central way of participating, thereby becoming competent and empowered members of a community of practice. That is, learning is conceived as “an evolving form of membership” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53).

---

\(^{34}\) For a discussion of learning as participation, see also Sfard (1998).


\(^{36}\) Lave and Wenger (1991) define a community of practice as “a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (p. 98). See also Wenger (1998).
Broadly speaking, what lies at the heart of the situative approach is the view of learning as *appropriation*: learning involves appropriating the tools and practices of a community, together with the ability to perform a specific role in the system. This process of appropriation “occurs though situated social practices [including formal classrooms] that have emerged in the culture to facilitate learning” (Sawyer & Greeno, 2009, p. 353). In other words, learning occurs in complex social settings, often characterized by a variety of artifacts that are the result of complex historical processes: learning environments are complex social systems (Jacobson & Kapur, 2012; Sawyer & Greeno, 2009).

Consequently, in a situative view of learning, the emergent properties of a learning environment “cannot be reduced to the mental structures of the individual participants” (Sawyer & Greeno, 2009, p. 360); rather, one needs to examine the interactions among individuals, and between individuals and the material world. It is in fact through these interactions that cognition is achieved as a situated, dynamic process. Thus, to develop a situative account of learning, the recorded conversations among participants and the “contributions of the material and technological tools and artifacts of the system” (Sawyer & Greeno, 2009, p. 362) should both be analyzed. Such an analysis will thereby describe the transformations of the entire system and the transformations of the participants’ knowledge structures.

Now, if learning is conceived “as an empirical phenomenon, as something material found and constituted in interaction between people” (Sahlström, 2009, p. 103), CA clearly represents an ideal methodology for a situative investigation of learning. CA in fact allows for a systematic, empirical analysis of how changes in participation occur...
in naturally occurring interaction, both on a moment-by-moment basis and over time. Indeed various CA researchers have embraced a situated theory of learning and have conducted studies in a variety of learning environments: physiotherapist-patient encounters (Martin, 2009; Martin & Sahlström, 2010); flight lessons (Melander & Sahlström, 2009b); child-initiated reading (Melander & Sahlström, 2010); and writing conferences (Vehviläinen, 2009). At the same time, CA scholars interested in exploring second language learning within a situative theory of learning have looked at: collaborative game-play (Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009); institutional phone calls (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004); and the second language classroom (Hellermann, 2009; Hellermann & Cole, 2009).37

Overall, CA studies on situated learning typically examine how learners change their participation in specific communities of practice by developing specific interactional practices.38 Such studies view learning as embedded in the structures of interaction, and situated in a specific material setting. “Learning as rooted in the learner’s embodied participation in social practices is emphasized as well as the continuous interactional adaptation to unfolding circumstances and activities” (Carlgren, 2009, p. 203). This process of adaptation requires a situational understanding, rooted in the interaction as it unfolds in the surrounding material environment. In fact, every action displays a particular understanding of the prior turn-at-talk and of the course of action it performs, and a more general understanding of the activity in which the participants are involved.

---

37 I am quoting here only the studies that explicitly invoke situated learning as a theory of learning that grounds data interpretation. Typically, these studies attempt longitudinal case analyses. In a broader sense, though, learning in CA is conceptualized as always situated, both in the details of the interaction and in the surrounding material environment (see also see Chapter 1, section 1.3).

38 A more recent line of inquiry in this field is focusing on how participants orient to the content of learning. See for example Melander & Sahlström (2009a).
In this perspective, then, understanding, knowing, and acting are strongly intertwined: “knowing grows out of the gradual adjustments in actions” (Carlgren 2009, p. 204), which in turn display specific understandings. Learning can thus be defined as “changes in people’s doing of understanding” (Carlgren, 2009, p. 204) and as “changes in the orientations toward the co-constructed content” of learning as it is constituted in interaction (Melander & Sahlström, 2009b, p. 151). At the same time, learning occurs as action (Sahlström, 2011), in the moment-by-moment unfolding of the interaction. In other words, “learning is not only something [i.e., a change] that might or might not happen […], but rather the activity itself” (Sahlström, 2011, p. 55): the participants ostensibly do learning. And CA – with its emic focus on the details of emergent interaction – is an ideal tool to document and analyze learning both synchronically (i.e., learning-as-action) and longitudinally (i.e., learning-as-change).

2.2.6 Socially distributed cognition in CA for second language studies

In the previous section I mentioned how CA can be fruitfully applied to the study of situated learning, in a variety of institutional settings. In this section, I focus on what an ethnomethodological respecification of cognition and learning entails in the field of second language studies (SLS). I do so by summarizing the main tenets of three discursive approaches to socially distributed cognition: ethnomethodology (EM),

---

39 Learning-as-action is similar to what Markee (2008), Markee and Seo (2009), and Markee and Kunitz (2013) call language learning behavior (see below). However, Markee’s work does not use situated learning as a theoretical framework (see Chapter 1, section 1.3). For a discussion of different CA strands in the field of second language studies see: Kasper (2006); Lee (2010); Markee (2008); Sahlström (2011).
discursive psychology (DP), and CA.\textsuperscript{40} I will then discuss the “purist” (Lee, 2010, p. 406) conversation analytic approach to language learning.

EM, DP, and CA share a view of cognition as interrelated with social actors’ discursive practices. Cognition is thus to be analyzed “as embedded in social interaction and locally and contingently occasioned by current interactional events” (Kasper, 2008, p. 2). Specifically, EM (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984a) – which is the source discipline for all of these discursive approaches – focuses on practical reasoning, that is on the way participants make sense of their actions and thereby accomplish mutual understanding and, with it, social order. DP (Edwards, 1997, 2006; te Molder & Potter, 2005), in turn, is interested in how participants construct cognitive and affective states as topics in talk and text. The object of scrutiny is therefore how participants describe events with the situated use of psychological terms and how they exploit the rhetorical organization of event descriptions (Kasper, 2008) to do learning, affect, cognition, etc., as topics of everyday talk. On the other hand, CA focuses exclusively on talk-in-interaction (and not on text) to investigate: (a) how participants accomplish mutual understanding through the organization of action in interaction (Schegloff, 1991; Heritage, 1984a); and (b) how participants display their epistemic statuses and stances in interaction (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b; Kärkäinen, 2003, 2006).

Specifically, Kasper (2008) identifies three “intersections of interaction and cognition” (p. 6) within the CA perspective on socially distributed cognition. First of all, CA is concerned with the interactional practices through which participants construct and maintain mutual understanding. Practices like turn-taking (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff

\textsuperscript{40} The discussion in this section is mainly based on Kasper (2008, 2009), and Markee & Seo (2009).
2000a), repair (Schegloff 1979, 1992, 1997, 2000b; Schegloff et al., 1977), and preference organization (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Schegloff 2007) constitute the interactional mechanisms through which mutual understanding can be achieved (Heritage, 1984a). Through these practices participants monitor their own talk and the talk of other interactants, are able to recognize current and projected courses of action, and can signal (and usually fix) problems in understanding whenever they occur. By performing a specific action, each turn-at-talk displays a specific understanding of the prior turn, and at the same time sets up a new local, interactional context, which constitutes “the frame of relevance” (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 289) for subsequent actions and displays of understanding. Socially shared cognition (Schegloff, 1991) is thus collaboratively accomplished by participants as they locally manage, display, and co-construct action and understanding through the use of interactional practices.

The second intersection of interaction and cognition is represented by the linguistic resources – such as modal verbs, verbs of thinking, and response tokens, to mention just a few – through which cognitive states and processes are claimed or displayed. That is, interactants use these resources as markers of their “epistemic positioning” (Sahlström, 2011, p. 52) with respect to what they are saying and doing. As Kasper (2008) points out, “cognitive claims and displays are thus seen as interactionally occasioned and intertwined with the action(s) that participants are accomplishing at particular moments in the talk” (p. 8).

Finally, the third intersection of interaction and cognition includes the display of cognitive moments (Drew, 2005). Through their interactional conduct participants show, for example, moments of confusion (Drew, 2005) or displays of memory and recall
Crucially, these moments are generated within and manifested through interaction, and are thereby socially organized. Importantly, Potter (2006) has warned CA scholars interested in this type of analysis against the use of descriptive language that might be characterized by cognitivist assumptions about actual mental states. He thus suggests that analysts use expressions such as display and orientation, in order “to describe interaction without assuming any particular version of cognition, or even that cognition in any of its range of technical senses, is taking place at all” (p. 138).

Now, if participants – with a variety of interactional resources – display to each other their understandings and their epistemic stances, one can say that “cognition goes public” (Kasper, 2009, p. 12). That is, displays of cognition become publicly accessible to participants and analysts as well. Clearly, behavioral manifestations of cognition do not necessarily represent the participants’ inner state (Potter, 2006; Schegloff, 1991; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009). Indeed, CA is agnostic as to the nature of individual psycholinguistic processes underlying behavioral manifestations of cognition. Those processes are beyond the scope of CA scrutiny as their investigation is not afforded by CA methodology. “Consequently CA requires a non-mentalist stance as an analytical policy” (Kasper, 2006, p. 84). What CA can do, though, is developing detailed analyses of socially distributed moments of cognition, including analyses of learning behaviors as observable conversational processes, occurring in the intersubjective space between participants (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496).

The present project is concerned with second language learning behaviors in general and, more specifically, with planning behaviors in language learning environments. As mentioned above (see also Chapter 1, section 1.3), some CA scholars
working in the SLS field have adopted situated learning theory as an interpretive framework for their analyses. Other CA practitioners have framed their findings within other theories of learning as a social activity, such as sociocultural theory (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Ohta, 2001) and language socialization (He, 2004, 2006). What all these theories have in common is a view of cognition as socially distributed and of “social interaction in situated activities as the locus and constitutive process of learning” (Kasper, 2006, p. 91). On the other hand, other researchers (Kasper, 2004; Lee, 2010; Markee, 1994, 2000, 2008, 2011; Markee & Seo, 2009; Markee & Kunitz, 2013; Mori, 2002, 2004; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009) have relied on CA’s own methodological and theoretical potential (Kasper, 2006, p. 93) to develop emic accounts of language learning behaviors in talk-in-interaction (Markee & Kasper, 2004). As Markee (2008) argues, adopting exogenous, a priori theories as interpretive frameworks of language learning behaviors imposes an etic burden on CA, which is ultimately alien to CA’s original emic perspective. The proposed solution is therefore to stay “methodologically true to CA” (Markee, 2008, p. 405) and analyze “learning in and as the members’ phenomena” (Lee, 2010, p. 409; emphasis in the original). Crucially, then, the goal is analyzing how learning is done and is oriented to by participants in and through talk-in-interaction. In other words, CA analysts should describe language learning behaviors in their own terms (Markee & Seo, 2009, p. 38), as collaboratively achieved by participants and naturally occurring in real time. As Kasper (2006) puts it:

CA provides a method of observing socially distributed cognition in the same way as social actors do, viz. by registering how coparticipants simultaneously produce coordinated social actions and display their understandings to each other through
their interactional conduct [...] In the same way, participants and analysts are afforded evidence of socially distributed learning. (p. 93).

As mentioned in the Introduction (section 1.3), it is within this last CA approach to the field of SLS that I wish to situate my study. In the following I will thus briefly sketch the principles and goals of such an endeavor.

First of all, the object of empirical investigation consists in those interactional moments where learning is observably oriented to by participants as their focal concern. In such moments, participants use talk, bodily action, and the orientation to relevant tools and artifacts (Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Markee & Kunitz, 2013) to display their epistemic positioning and to “recognizably and accountably ‘do’ learning as a social activity” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 127) through various kinds of language learning behaviors. These behaviors are public in that they are collaboratively co-constructed by participants in and through talk-in-interaction (Markee & Seo, 2009). They thereby constitute and are “analyzable as micro-moments of socially distributed cognition” (Markee, 2008, p. 409). Some examples include: repair sequences (including word searches); emphatic claims of understanding; claims or displays of changes in epistemic state; translation, etc. According to Mori and Hasegawa (2009), then, a sound CA analysis of learning-oriented interactional moments needs to show:

how a display of one’s own cognitive states is socially situated, how it is treated by the coparticipants, as well as how cognitive artifacts [e.g., textbooks and notebooks] co-present at the site of interaction are manipulated and figured in the organization of activities. (p. 90)
In this way, it is possible to develop behavioral and process-oriented accounts of language learning as a socially distributed practice (Markee & Seo, 2009, p. 38).

2.3 CA analyses of task-based instruction

2.3.1 Introduction

Task-based instruction (TBI) is now an established pedagogical practice, rooted in the definition of tasks as devices that, involving a primary focus on meaning, elicit purposeful interaction among learners and thereby promote acquisition (Ellis, 2003). Over the last two decades, TBI has received a great deal of scholarly attention, mostly within quantitative SLA (see for example: Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Long, to appear; Nunan, 2004); however, important qualitative investigations have been conducted as well (see among others: Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 2004; Ohta, 2001).

The present section will focus on the qualitative exploration of tasks, specifically on the investigation of the relationship between task-as-work plan and task-as-activity (Coughlan & Duff, 1994) or task-in-process (Breen, 1989). After a brief description of the “split personality” (Seedhouse, 2005a, p. 533) of tasks and of its consequences for the construct validity of TBI/SLA studies, I will discuss the usefulness of a CA methodology in TBI research and will report some examples from two CA studies on TBI (Mori, 2002; Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010). The present discussion is relevant for the analytical chapters that follow, where I will adopt a conversation analytic approach to the study of pre-task planning as situated activity. As we will see, the conversation analysis of the students’ planning practices discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 reveals the students’
conceptualization of the final task, thereby offering crucial insights into the students’ implementation of the task itself.

2.3.2 The “split personality” of tasks

Researchers agree that a task is “a plan for learner activity” (Ellis, 2003, p. 9): it is “a proposal for language learning work” (Breen, 1989, p. 188) designed through the selection and the combination of specific goals, content, and procedures (see also Markee, 1997). In other words, a task-as-work plan is a “behavioral blueprint” (Coughlan & Duff, 1994, p. 175) used to create opportunities for L2 use.

Despite its intended predictive nature (Breen, 1989, p. 188), though, the task-as-work plan does not have a cause-effect relation on the subsequent implementation of the task: like any other type of plan, the task-as-work plan is a mere projection of future actions, with which it entertains an interesting, albeit unexplicated, relationship (Suchman, 2007). A plan, in fact, can never fully specify the circumstances of action, “the unforeseeable contingencies of actual situations” (Suchman, 2007, p. 31), where human actors use the resources at their disposal to act in a specific space and time, according to their specific local needs.

In the unfolding circumstances of action-in-the-making, the task-as-work plan becomes a task-in-process: the accomplishment of the task is co-constructed on a moment-by-moment basis, through the participants’ continuous adaptation to the local interactional contingencies, and according to their ongoing interpretations of the task itself and of the instructional setting in which it takes place (Mori, 2002; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010). Put another way, the task-as-work plan is finally implemented as an activity, which “comprises the behavior
that is actually produced” (Coughlan & Duff, 1994, p. 175) by the participants in a given context: the task-as-activity is a locally organized, “contingent, co-constructed phenomenon” (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 26) that results from the participants’ situated orientation to the task and to their co-constructed interaction. Therefore, the participants (i.e., the learners) – through their interpretive work and their active role in task accomplishment – redefine and reconfigure the task in relationship to the actual circumstances of its implementation (Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler, 2004, p. 502) and to their current learning needs (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 43).

Specifically, in the classroom setting, the frequent mismatch between task-as-work plan and task-as-activity can be due to a number of issues: (i) the learners’ disengagement with the task, eventually leading to off-task talk and off-task activities; (ii) the impact of group dynamics on the implementation of the task; (iii) the learners’ misunderstanding of participation requirements and of the pedagogical focus/goal; and (iv) the teacher’s inability to convey clear instructions (Seedhouse, 2005a, pp. 537-543).

2.3.3 The issue of construct validity in TBI/SLA research

A general caveat presents itself to teachers, materials designers, and researchers whenever they try to assess the effectiveness of task design and its impact on students’ learning. Since any task-in-process may generate specific affordances for learning and changes in knowledge, an “evaluation of outcomes related only to the criteria of work plan objectives can actually hide more than it will reveal” (Breen, 1989, p. 189). In other words, any attempt at evaluating the effectiveness of a task-as-work plan should take into consideration the local circumstances of its implementation.
At any rate, the “split personality” of tasks (Seedhouse, 2005a, p. 533) presents a serious issue especially for researchers embracing a quantitative, experimental paradigm, which is grounded on the importance of construct validity. To meet validity requirements, a construct “must be defined in such a way that it becomes measurable” (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007, p. 7) and therefore controllable and comparable. As Coughlan and Duff (1994) observe, “while the task or blueprint may be the same, the activity it generates will be unique” (p. 190). No matter how accurately the work plan has been set up, it will invariably be implemented as different activities. In other words, a task cannot be assumed as a constant in measurement and one should be extremely cautious in generalizing from data that may be based on similar, albeit distinct, activities.

At the same time, there is another validity requirement that should be satisfied: once a construct has been defined in a measurable way, what is measured needs to coincide with what is claimed to be measured. However, as Seedhouse (2005a, pp. 545-546) notes, while quantitative research on TBI is conceptualized in terms of the task-as-work plan, research data are gathered from the task-in-process. That is, what is claimed to be measured is conceptualized in terms of the task-as-work plan, even though what is actually measured/researched is the task-as-activity. For example, learning outcomes are assessed as a function of the task-as-work plan (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 26), but are quantified by measuring certain features of the task-as-activity. This would not be a problem if the task-in-process reflected the original work plan, but given the split personality of tasks, this way of conducting quantitative research may threaten the validity of its findings. Quite interestingly, as Seedhouse (2005a, p. 545) points out, the TBI/SLA literature acknowledges and accepts the frequent mismatch between task-as-
work plan and task-in-process; however, the implications of this mismatch for construct validity are typically not addressed.

But this is not the only issue. The task-as-work plan – which is the basis of conceptualization in TBI quantitative research – is specified etically; i.e., according to categories that are imposed, top-down, by the researcher. The task-in-process, though, can only be specified emically; i.e., according to the participants’ ongoing orientation to the task-as-activity. The crux of the matter becomes manifest, for example, in research on the focus of a task. Typically, in the TBI/SLA literature, the focus of a task is intended as the learners’ focus (see the definitions of form focused instruction in: Ellis, 2001; Long, 1996; Doughty, 2001). However, TBI/SLA researchers etically create their typologies of task foci by using the task-as-work plan as a predictive indicator of what the learners’ emic focus will be. However, the task-as-work plan cannot fully specify what learners will do. Thus, the only way to explore the learners’ focus is to empirically investigate what they actually do during the task-in-process, thereby conducting a bottom-up, emic analysis of the interaction through which the task is implemented and accomplished.

Furthermore, quantitative research on TBI has generally given scant attention to the nature of interactional data and its endogenous organization. Combined with the use of deductively derived and etically imposed categories, this approach generally leads to scanning the interactional data for those categories. The risk, though, is that – by overlooking the details of the interactional organization – instances of talk-in-interaction that are fundamentally different and perform distinct actions in specific interactional environments might be homogenized under the same categories. As Seedhouse (2005a)
puts it, “it is invalid to homogenize discoursal data by inputting them into quantitative machinery without first having conducted a case-by-case qualitative emic analysis” (p. 551).

Seedhouse (2005a, p. 547) thus invokes the adoption of a CA approach to the study of tasks-in-process. CA is committed to an emic perspective and is particularly attentive to the endogenous organization of talk-in-interaction. A CA approach to TBI research would allow us to inductively derive the categories of investigation from detailed, case-by-case analyses of the data. After a first stage employing CA, one could eventually proceed to a quantitative analysis of the categories that have emerged from the empirical investigation of the task-in-process. The focus of conceptualization would then be on the task-in-process itself, while the task-as-work plan would be a point of comparison: construct validity might then possibly be preserved.

2.3.4 CA studies on TBI

In her study of an advanced Japanese classroom, Mori (2002) explores the relationship between the instructional design of a task called zadankai ("discussion meeting") and the students’ implementation of it. Zadankai refers to the visits of Japanese native speakers to the L2 classroom, in order to foster the students’ understanding of social and cultural issues. The task-as-work plan designed for this specific classroom was conceived as a mutual exchange of opinions and experiences about participants’ relationships with their fathers. Specifically, the students were expected to: (i) explain what they had studied so far on the designated topic; (ii) ask questions about the guests’ relationship with their fathers; and (iii) tell the guests about their own relationships with their fathers. The
zadankai was thereby conceptualized by the teacher as a discussion on a given topic with no pre-allocation of turns at talk.

However, an investigation of the students’ planning session and of the task-as-activity revealed how the learners mostly interpreted and implemented the zadankai as a structured interview of the native speakers. They issued a list of questions and gathered information from the native speakers, without volunteering any information about themselves. Specifically, the students asked a question; upon receiving an answer, they tended to respond with repetitions or minimal acknowledgement tokens in third position; subsequently, they moved to another question without expanding on the content of the native speaker’s answer. This practice is exemplified in Figure 2.9 below (Mori, 2002, p. 330).

FIGURE 2.9 – ZADANKAI AS STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1 OAKLAND: nannin kyoo- nannin kyoodai desu ka? how many sibli- how many siblings?
2 SASAKI: ee:tte futari kyoodai desu.=ani ga imasu. uh:m two siblings.=I have an older brother.
3 OAKLAND: ani. older brother.
4 (2.3)
5 SASAKI: ¨soo desu.¨ ¨that’s right.¨
6 (0.8)
7 OAKLAND: soide otoosan wa::: ano::: (1.0) eeto:: then your father we::ll uh:m mainichi:: yuugohan ni kaette kite:::, he came home for supper everyday a:::nd,
8 sono ato: mata ano::: shigoto ni ikimashita ka? after thaat did he go back to work again?
9 =soretomo- (1.0) uchi ni? =or- stayed home?
10 SASAKI: "u::nº "uh::mº
More specifically, in line 1, Oakland asks Sasaki how many siblings she has. Upon receiving an answer (line 2), Oakland repeats part of it (line 3); after a rather long pause (line 4), Sasaki confirms Oakland’s understanding (line 5); Oakland then moves to a different question, without taking the opportunity to follow up on that topic by either asking a related question or volunteering some information about his own family. At the same time, note how Sasaki does not orient to reciprocating Oakland’s question and aligns with Oakland’s interpretation of the task as a structured interview. It is important to state, though, that the native speakers did not receive any instructions as to how the interactional encounter was supposed to be conducted.

On the other hand, an investigation of the students’ pre-task planning session revealed how at least one of them, Miles, did indeed orient to the instruction that students should give information about themselves, but explicitly addressed the difficulty of planning in advance “a smooth entry into a telling” (Mori, 2002, p. 338). In Miles’s words: “But what if our guests don’t ask us about our parents. If that is the case, what shall we do?” (Mori, 2002, p. 336; simplified and translated from Japanese). In such circumstances, then, when the contingent development of talk cannot be anticipated, the only thing that the students could do was to plan a series of sequence-initiating actions (i.e., questions). They certainly could not predict when and how a telling on their part would become relevant.

In conclusion, investigating planning sessions can be useful in order to better interpret the task-as-activity. If one were to look only at the final outcome of the task, it would be easy to conclude that the students completely disregarded the third part of the instructions. Instead, Miles’s concern – as manifested in the planning session – displays
his orientation to the instructions and his willingness to comply. Therefore, the students cannot be held entirely accountable for the transformation of the task-as-work plan in a substantially different activity. Miles’s observation and the lack of instructions for the native speakers cast some doubt about how the instructions were given (or not). In other words, the teacher herself appears at least partially accountable for the way the task-as-activity was implemented. This finding may have important pedagogical consequences, since – if the teacher sees herself as partially accountable – she might reconsider the task design in a subsequent iteration.

In a more recent study, Hellermann and Pekarek-Doehler (2010) focus on a direction giving task and, more specifically, on the transition into the task: from the end of task instructions to the participants’ involvement with the task. According to these researchers, in fact, transitions into the task are privileged moments to analyze for two reasons: (a) transitions represent the moments when “the process of transformation of task-as-work plan into task-as-process begins” (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 42); and (b) transitions are particularly suited to observe tasks from an emic perspective, showing how the participants orient to the task and display their interpretation of it.

Transitions are interactionally complex moments that, in leading from task negotiation to task accomplishment, require coordination of action (Markee, 2004). If the participants have a convergent orientation, then joint task accomplishment is achieved, even if the actual implementation of the task may differ considerably from task design, and even if there may be great variation in the students’ interpretations of the same task-as-work plan (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 27). On the other hand, if the participants happen to have parallel agendas, the outcome might be multiple
misalignments. Eventually, the lack of a convergent orientation among the participants may block task accomplishment.

Let us consider two examples showing how the same task-as-work plan can be implemented in very different ways, even though the instructions and the setting (a classroom of adult immigrant beginner learners of English in a community college in the US) are the same. The teacher gave the students a model dialogue on a piece of paper; the dialogue was also written on the board; she then practiced the dialogue with the students and finally instructed them to make a conversation using the model dialogue, but changing the destinations. The teacher’s instructions are reported in Figure 2.10 (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 31).

FIGURE 2.10 – TEACHER’S INSTRUCTIONS

1 TEACHER: make another conversation. you can use this example, but not post office. maybe think about this area here. around this building. you could say maybe excuse me:: how do i get to the:: bank. how do i get to mcdonald’s. or how do i get to the deli. okay. (.)
2 use this example. but make a conversation.
3 >together<, (.)with places (.) here.
4 around this “building” okay?

In lines 1-4 the teacher instructs the students to use the model dialogue as an example for their conversation, but they have to change the destination; she then exemplifies how the students could use the model dialogue to ask directions about a variety of places (lines 4-7); finally she repeats the instructions (lines 8-10) she just gave.

During the task performance, two pairs of students interpreted the task very differently: one pair as an oral task, the other pair as collaborative dialogue writing. In the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.11 (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 30) a
pair of students (Julia, Portuguese L1, and Gongyi, Mandarin L1) uses the model dialogue as a basis for their oral performance.

FIGURE 2.11 – PERFORMING A DIALOGUE

1  [(16.0)]
2  [((J & G looking at notes; G copying model dialogue))]
3  JULIA: [((J & G put down pens))]
4  [((shift posture toward one another))]
5  [excuse me (0.5) how do you <get to the> (.). deli?]
6  GONGYI: de::li?=  
7  JULIA: =deli. how do you (.). HO- >okay< how do you <how>  
8  excuse me how do you get to the: uh li-?  
9  (life restaurants.)
10 GONGYI: ( )
11 JULIA : mm hm?
12 GONGYI: ( [ ])
13 JULIA : [(I know)] how do you excuse me how do you get  
14 to CHinese restaurant  
15 GONGYI: mm (.). eh "so" (.). go straight, go straight, mm  

Once the teacher has given the instructions, Julia and Gongyi spend 16 seconds to look at their notebooks and worksheets (lines 1-2); during this time, Gongyi finishes writing the last part of the model dialogue. Finally, a shift in posture occurs, so that the two students are now facing each other (line 4). With this body orientation, the two signal their shift to a new course of action; i.e., engaging in a conversation based on the model dialogue. Moreover, by putting their pens down (line 3), the students display their orientation to the task as an activity that does not involve writing. The first move in actual task implementation is performed by Julia, who asks directions for the deli (line 5); however, Gongyi initiates repair on the word deli (line 6), an action which is interpreted by Julia as an indication that the word deli is not recognized. She thereby changes her destination and asks directions for a Chinese restaurant (line 14). Gongyi replies with the relevant directions (line 15). This pair of students, then, interprets the task as an oral activity and seems to closely follow the teacher’s directions.
Another pair of students (Andrea and Jorge), though, implemented the task in a different way. First of all, they interpreted it as a collaborative writing task, thereby engaging in writing a new dialogue. Second, they deviated from the instructions, in that they chose a farther destination (i.e., the local department store) and ended up giving directions on how to take the bus. The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.12.1 (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 32) picks up the talk right after the teacher has finished giving the instructions.

FIGURE 2.12.1 – WRITING A DIALOGUE

1
2
3
4
5
6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(((Andrea is writing the first line of the dialogue))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(((writing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANDREA: [what is near here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>qué hay cerca de aquí.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JORGE: la tienda, la tienda, el hotel. no sé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the store, the store, the hotel. I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see “the first move toward orienting to the task as ‘crafting a written dialogue’” (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 32). Andrea, in fact, starts writing the first line of the dialogue (lines 1-2). Note how this is her own individual initiative. She then solicits Jorge’s participation by asking which nearby destination they might select (line 4); she does so in Spanish, the participants’ lingua franca (marked in italics in the transcript).

The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.12.2 (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, pp. 33-34) picks up the talk at a later moment in the interaction. The students have just selected the local department store as the target destination for their dialogue and have agreed to give instructions on how to take the bus. Note also that most of the interaction so far has been conducted in Spanish.
FIGURE 2.12.2 – WRITING A DIALOGUE

1 ANDREA: okay. a ver, cómo le dirías entonces.
       okay. let’s see. how would you say it then.

2 JORGE: bueno.
       ok.

3 ANDREA: take the bus. toma el camión derecho.
       take the bus straight.

4 JORGE: go. take the bus.

5 ANDREA: entonces sería take?
       then it would be take?

6 JORGE: mm hmm.

7 ANDREA: the bus?

8 JORGE: take the bus. (.) going.

9 ANDREA: toma el camión para el centro.
       take the bus downtown.

10 cómo se dice take the bus.
       how do you say

11 JORGE: take the bus, and the >take the bus< take the bus (.)
12 no. take the bus, go (.) go to the downtown portland
13 to the downtown portland,

14 tómate el camión y vas al centro de portland,
       take the bus and go to downtown Portland,

15 ANDREA: entonces take the bus to downtown,
       then

16 JORGE: to downtown

17 ANDREA: cómo se escribe downtown downtown.
       how do you spell

At the beginning of Figure 2.12.2 the participants then orient to formulating the
directions in English. A process of negotiation ensues, during which Spanish is used as
the language of the interaction: to ask questions (cómo le dirías entonces, line 1; cómo se
dice take the bus, line 10); to ask for confirmation (entonces sería take?, line 5) about
possible translations into English; to verify the accuracy of English expressions via a
retranslation into Spanish (toma el camión derecho, line 3; tómate el camión y vas al
centro de portland, line 14); to formulate a possible scriptline (toma el camión para el
Finally, the students collaboratively come to the final formulation, in English: *take the bus to downtown* (line 15). At this point, the question *cómo se escribe downtown* (line 17) displays Andrea’s orientation to the task as a collaborative writing activity.

The two pairs of students, then, despite receiving the same instructions in the same classroom by the same teacher, end up accomplishing two very different activities that create different learning affordances. Specifically, the oral activity of performing a dialogue clearly fosters the development of the students’ speaking skills, while the collaborative dialogue writing seems to lead the students to take more risks and stretch their abilities in order to formulate new expressions for which they do not already have a model. Another important difference is related to the second pair’s conspicuous use of Spanish as a lingua franca: the availability of a common, shared language may affect the way the interaction is conducted. Both of these observations clearly lead to important pedagogical questions: (i) Should the teacher intervene, once she realizes that some students are implementing the task in a way that differs considerably from the work plan and its goals? (ii) What should the teacher do when students resort to their L1 or to a shared lingua franca? The answers are of course open to debate and a brief discussion of some of these matters will be presented in the conclusions of this dissertation.

For now suffice it to say that, evidently, “[…] students co-construct different task trajectories in a locally contingent way” (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 42), and that the task learning potentials emerge as the task is accomplished on a moment-by-

41 As we will see later, some of these practices are very common in my data as well (see the two analytical chapters for the formulation of script lines and for translation and retranslation practices between the L1 and the L2).
moment basis. Learning affordances are thereby “locally configured” (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 43) through the co-construction of talk-in-interaction, where the participants’ orientation to each other, to the task, and to the instructional setting is sequentially displayed, turn-by-turn. In other words, the task-as-activity results from the students’ re-appropriation and reconfiguration of the task that is accomplished according to their current needs. These needs arise in and through talk-in-interaction and create a variety of locally defined learning affordances, targeting learning objects such as grammar, vocabulary, methods for turn construction, recipient design work, etc. (Hellermann & Pekarek-Doelher, 2010, p. 27).

In conclusion, the social interaction through which a task is implemented and “the related coordination of perspectives, activities, and cognitive efforts” (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004, p. 514) create specific learning affordances, and shape not only the context of learning, but the very meaning of what learning is. In order to investigate how different learning affordances arise and are actually taken up by the students, a detailed analysis of how tasks unfold in and through interaction is necessary. Given its commitment to an emic perspective and to a sequential, turn-by-turn analysis of social interaction, CA seems particularly well suited to this type of analysis.

2.4 Language alternation and codeswitching

2.4.1 The relevance of language alternation in the present study

Given the many instances of language alternation in my data, it seems logical to investigate such a ubiquitous practice in a work that aims at describing what students do during group planning in L2 instructional settings. My dissertation then, following the interactional perspective on CS (Auer, 1998, 2000; Gafaranga, 2000, 2005, 2009;
Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; Wei, 1998, 2002, 2005) – and, within it, Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) terminology – investigates how various L1/L2 alternation patterns are used as interactional resources by participants to achieve planning on a moment-by-moment basis. Furthermore, this investigation can give us a better understanding of the participants’ orientation to the two languages and of the emic criteria to which the students orient in preparing their presentation.

Previous research on language alternation has mainly focused on L1 use in the L2 classroom; i.e., in a setting where students are typically expected (if not policed; see Amir & Musk, 2013) to use the L2. In contrast, not much attention has been devoted to the functions of L2 use in environments of language alternation in settings where the students are free to interact in one language or the other as they accomplish classroom-related tasks. Moreover, it is also relevant to investigate the interplay between the L1 and the L2, and what that reveals about the students’ orientation to the two languages and to the task in which they are engaged. It is along these lines that the present study is intended to contribute to the existing body of research on the practices of language alternation enacted by L2 learners.

In the following, I briefly review three important perspectives on language alternation: the multilingual/ecological perspective, the cognitive perspective, and the interactional perspective. These perspectives view language alternation as a resource available to multilingual speakers for the co-construction of meaning, and consider the

---

42 However, for research in classrooms where L1 use is explicitly allowed or at least implicitly accepted, see: Cromdal (2005); Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher (2009); Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain (2004, 2005, 2007); Levine (2009, 2011).

43 In line with Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009), I adopt the expression language alternation as the general label for any instance of use of two (or more) languages in a conversation. See subsection 2.3.4 for the distinction between language alternation and codeswitching.
language classroom as an environment where students practice being multilingual speakers.\textsuperscript{44} From this standpoint, the target is multi-competence rather than nativelikeness. Furthermore, L2 learners are viewed “as (variably) competent co-participants” (Kasper, 2006, p. 90) rather than as deficient communicators. As Cook (1996) suggests, “the starting point should be what L2 learners are like in their own right rather than how they fail to reach standards set by people that they are not by definition [i.e., native speakers]” (p. 64).

\textbf{2.4.2 The multilingual/ecological perspective}

The multilingual/ecological perspective is motivated by a consideration of the complexities of our contemporary multilingual world (Canagarajah, 2007; Kramsch, 2009). Such a globalized context challenges the foundations of traditional language teaching, since it questions the existence of homogeneous national cultures and the monolingual native use of a standard language (Kramsch, 2009, p. 190). As Canagarajah (2007) suggests, in a multilingual, transnational world, teachers should not focus on one language variety; rather, they should help the students develop “a readiness to engage with a repertoire of codes in transnational contact situations” (p. 936).

Moreover, today learners of additional languages are not necessarily monolingual speakers of their L1, but rather “learners with embodied memories of various languages acquired in various circumstances and with varying degrees of proficiency” (Kramsch, 2009, p. 190). That is, they come to the language classroom with a linguistic repertoire that is going to be enriched by the additional language of their choice. In such a scenario, aiming for monolingual, native-like proficiency (an unattainable goal for all but an

\textsuperscript{44} This is in clear contrast with an L2-only policy, often linked to a view of native-like, monolingual proficiency as the primary goal of instruction.
extremely small percentage of language learners) does not make much sense: L2 teachers and curriculum designers should rather aim for creating multilingual speakers. This orientation implies a “reconceptualization of the foreign language classroom as a bilingual [or multilingual] environment and language learners as aspiring bilinguals [or multilinguals]” (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009, p. 131). In the classroom, L2 learners develop their identity as multilingual subjects. L2 learners, in fact, are symbolic entities that are constituted through the intrapersonal and interpersonal use of various symbolic systems, including the languages in their repertoire (Kramsch, 2009, p. 25).

Through the use of these symbolic systems – which in turn are embedded in a web of social relations – the subject assumes a specific position. From this standpoint, the subject interacts with other subjects discursively, socially, and culturally. That is, she defines herself and is defined through the interaction with other subjects and through the symbolic systems used in this interaction. As Kramsch (2009, p. 20) observes, a multilingual subject can occupy many positions, depending on the chosen language, on the interlocutor(s), on the setting and the purpose of the interaction. In this view, then, the ability to use various symbolic systems is considered to be a powerful tool that allows the multilingual subject not only “to represent the world in different linguistic codes” (Kramsch, 2009, p. 188), but also to “create different symbolic realities in different

---

45 The definition of L2 learners as aspiring or developing bilinguals still adumbrates the idea of the learners’ defectiveness. Evidently, the core of the issue is the definition of the word bilingual itself: one could argue that any L2 learner – regardless of her proficiency level – is bilingual, in that she uses two languages. However, an expression like “aspiring bilinguals” rather seems to refer to balanced (or at least advanced) speakers of two languages, who proficiently use both languages in a non-classroom setting. To avoid confusion, in this study the expression “L2 user” will indicate any (more or less proficient) speaker of two languages, while the expression “L2 learner” will reference an L2 user in a classroom setting.
languages” (Kramsch, 2009, p. 188), and to change the others’ perception of social reality.

Hence, from the multilingual/ecological perspective, language alternation is not an indication of deficient proficiency in a language, but rather a highly skilled activity (Cook, 2001, 2007) through which the multilingual speaker makes what Cook, (2001:408) calls a “non-compartmentalized” use of the languages known to her. Language alternation is indeed a typical practice in multilingual communities, where it functions as a way to: (i) meet identity-related purposes; (ii) organize talk; and (iii) fill momentary gaps in accessing a particular language (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009a, p. 7).

For example, Gumperz (1982) claimed that, in a bilingual community, language alternation is functional to the distinction between the we-code (i.e., the minority language) and the they-code (i.e., the majority language). In other words, it serves identity-related purposes. Even if this interpretation of language alternation has been questioned in later studies conducted in various speech communities (see for example: Gafaranga, 2005; Wei, 2002),46 the idea that language choice indexes specific macro-social factors of identity (such as ethnicity, social class, etc.) still holds.

On the other hand, in their study of California language programs designed to support bilingualism in students’ early years in schools, Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005) show how language alternation is used to organize talk. Specifically, it is an everyday rhetorical device that is spontaneously adopted by bilingual children; it is taken to be equivalent to style switching and voicing among monolingual children. Language

46 In Gafaranga’s (2005) words: “Empirical observation of specific settings demonstrates that, in some cases, social roles such as we-code can be fulfilled by any of the languages available, and even by language alternation itself” (p. 291).
alternation, then, is comparable to other discourse level processes that have an indexical function and may function as a way to manage a collaborative task in peer-peer classroom interaction (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2005, p. 18).

In the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.13 (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2005, pp. 16-17), a group of Spanish-English bilingual children is engaged in collaboratively writing answers to some reading comprehension questions provided by the teacher. The answers are written in English. After an initial lack of group collaboration, the participants eventually get to work together. According to the authors, it is the switching to Spanish that plays a role in getting the participants on task. Spanish expressions appear in italics in the transcript.

FIGURE 2.13 – GETTING THE PARTICIPANTS ON TASK

1 GEORGE: \((\text{to Luis at next table})\) i’m helping these guys, ((points to Davida and Jorge))

3 DANIELA: WHAT of

4 GEORGE: \(\text{que no saben nada} \quad \text{who don’t know anything}\)

5 DANIELA: the Molly’s, … NO WAI:T ((stands up))
6 DAVIDA: I’m (only even on the third one) ((looks up at the aide standing behind her))

8 GEORGE: kay? ((to Luis at next table))
9 DANIELA: we’re wrong in the fourth one too: ((holding up four fingers))

12 GEORGE: \(\text{QUÉ?} \quad \text{WHAT?}\)

13 DAVIDA: that’s for YOU: I copied off YOU:
14 DANIELA: ALL OF U:S ((makes circle with hand around table))

15 GEORGE: what, yo no ( )
\(\text{not me}\)

16 DANIELA: en la cuatro estaba MA:L,
\(\text{in the fourth it was BA:D,}\)

17 porque (tú/te) crees que dijo la maestra \(\text{because}\)
\(\text{because (you) believe what the teacher said}\)
At the beginning of the fragment (lines 1-2 and 4), George is talking to a student sitting at another table, Luis, while Jorge and Davida are talking to the Student Aide, and Daniela is starting to answer the comprehension question *What advice does Mervin give Molly?* (line 3). In lines 1 and 4, George announces to Luis that he is helping two other students, Davida and Jorge, who do not know anything. Note here how the English formulation in line 1 qualifies George as a helpful student who is able to use English, while the Spanish formulation *que no saben nada* ("who don’t know anything") in line 4 negatively qualifies the other two students. Meantime, Daniela has started to work on the answer to the comprehension question by proposing two possible ways of beginning their answer: *what* (line 3) and *the Molly’s* (line 5). She then initiates repair (*NO WAIT*, line 5) and stands up, possibly to attract the other participants’ attention. As they do not orient to the course of action initiated by her, Daniela announces *we’re wrong in the fourth one too* (line 9), while holding up four fingers (line 10) to visually reference the question they are having trouble with. At this point, George initiates repair on Daniela’s announcement with Spanish *qué* ("what", line 12), while Davida blames Daniela as the one who is
responsible for their mistake, since she copied the answer from Daniela (line 13). However, Daniela resists this accusation by asserting that all of them are responsible for that wrong answer (line 14). George disagrees, by carefully extracting himself out of the collectivity with Spanish *yo no* (“not me”, line 15). Daniela then reissues her announcement about their being wrong in question number four. She does so in Spanish (line 16) and from this moment on the conversation switches to Spanish. Daniela refers to the teacher’s directions (lines 17-18), while George adds that the words in their answer need to be reordered (line 21). Finally, Daniela reformulates the first part of their answer with *Mervi::n gives Molly advice* (line 23) and meets George’s agreement (lines 25-26).

Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005, p. 17) interpret the switch to Spanish as a strategy to invoke common knowledge and therefore as an appeal to work together. After various attempts at getting her coparticipants’ attention (by raising the volume of her speech in lines 3 and 5, by standing up in line 5, and finally gesturing with her hand in line 10), Daniela eventually succeeds in her course of action by switching to Spanish (from line 16). At the same time, according to the researchers, the L1 is used to create an interactive space for free discussion among the coparticipants.

In another study by Levine (2011), it is shown how codeswitching is a common practice in college level language classes, despite the great variability of L1 and L2 use, both within and across classes. A common pattern seems for students to use the L2 in so called “structured” or “scripted” contexts; i.e., when communicating through guided textbook activities. While the L1 is mostly used in unscripted contexts, whether the topic of the conversation is content or language. Moreover, the L1 seems to be preferred in pair and group work; i.e., when students interact with one another. Through a discourse
analysis of various learner-learner interactions, Levine (2009, 2011) was able to demonstrate that learners codeswitch to build identities and relationships, and to characterize specific activities (such as asking/giving confirmation about the meaning of L2 lexical items).

Finally, a key issue for Levine is that of awareness: the students seem to use the L1 as the unmarked code; i.e., as “the most natural choice in a range of situations” (Levine, 2011, p. 83), without any principled and/or conscious reflection about the functions of this use. Levine (2011) therefore argues for developing the students’ awareness of code choice and its functions, through learner training and critical reflection about language alternation practices enacted by multilingual speakers in multilingual communities. This training would lead to co-constructed language alternation norms that would be specific to each classroom as its own community of practice. In other words, if the L2 classroom is to be reconceptualized as a microcosm of the multilingual community, language alternation may well be a teaching goal. As Cook (2001) observes, “many likely L2 goals for students involve mediating between two languages rather than staying entirely in the L2” (p. 408). Thus, students can be trained to operate with two or more languages in the classroom itself.

According to the multilingual/ecological perspective, then, there can be a place for using the L1 in L2 classrooms. Indeed, positioning L2 learners as multilingual speakers requires that they be viewed as interactionally competent participants, who use the linguistic resources at their disposal as semiotic tools to socially construct meaning in
context. In this framework, the L1 is just another resource and its use is neither aberrant nor meaningless (Levine, 2009, pp. 146-147). On the contrary, the L1 serves the purpose of building identities and relationships with coparticipants and their speech communities (Levine, 2009, 2011), thereby helping learners develop and live their multilingual identity (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009b, p. 183). Not only that, the use of the L1 in the classroom may also have practical advantages, such as guaranteeing the students’ understanding and saving time, but also allowing teachers and students to develop more personal connections (Cook, 2001, pp. 414-415).

In a similar (but more conservative) vein, Turnbull (2001) recommends complementarity between “judicious and principled use of L1” (p. 535) and the necessary maximization of L2 use (especially in foreign language classes where students need more exposure to the target language). According to Turnbull (2001), the amount of L1 use might be regulated by the students’ proficiency level in the L2.

Cummins (2007), in turn, makes a different point: the L2 classroom should help learners create “a shared or interdependent space” (p. 229) where language awareness would develop together with the students’ ability to make cross-linguistic connections. The creation of this space is crucial since optimal learning is promoted by building on prior knowledge, which is encoded in the L1: prior knowledge is mediated through the L1.

Finally, the change of target from nativelikeness to the acquisition of multilingual speaker status leads to a redefinition of competence as multilingual. Specifically, multilingual competence (or multi-competence) is a complex, dynamic system (Cummins, 2007).

Note how this view is shared by researchers working within the other two perspectives. For the interactional perspective, see for example Firth & Wagner (1997, 2007). For the cognitive perspective, see Swain & Deters (2007).
where all the languages known to the multilingual subject are simultaneously present, regardless of the achieved level of proficiency in each language (Cook, 2006, p. 43). This system subsumes an array of interactional strategies that allow the speaker to “create meaning out of shifting contexts” (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 932). The learner is thus construed “as a creative and resourceful multi-competent language user” who actively constructs meaning in the chosen code (Belz, 2002, pp. 64-65). Obviously, the concept of multi-competence has a major impact on the classical SLA notion of interlanguage. In fact, it recognizes the continual presence of the L1 in the learner’s mind together with any other additional language acquired by the learner. Thus the concept of multi-competence extends the notion of interlanguage (Cook, 2007).

In conclusion, the recognition of the contemporary globalized, transnational world leads researchers within the multilingual/ecological perspective to reconceptualize the language learner as a multilingual subject who positions herself in interaction by skillfully using the languages in her linguistic repertoire. Competence is redefined as multilingual and L1 use finds a legitimate place in classroom interaction, given that it is constantly present in the multilingual subject’s system of competence.

2.4.3 The cognitive perspective

From Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain’s (2009a) overview on the research findings regarding the functions of L1 use in L2 classrooms, one main conclusion emerges: L1 use can reduce the cognitive load of complex tasks, by “freeing up working memory capacity to work on the meaning of larger chunks of input” (Macaro, 2005, p. 74). In line with sociocultural theory, studies in the cognitive perspective support the idea that thinking and talking in the L1 scaffold the students’ engagement with the task at hand, with its
content, its language, and the cognitive operations it requires. The L1, in fact, mediates between prior and new knowledge, thereby playing an important role in the expansion of the learners’ abilities within their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978).

First of all, the L1 is the language of thought (Macaro, 2005). Centeno-Cortés and Jiménez (2004), for example, show how intermediate and advanced learners of Spanish use their L1 during private verbal thinking enacted while performing problem-solving tasks. Similarly, Macaro (2005, p. 77) reports on studies that focus on the effects of thinking in the L1 when engaged in a writing task (see: Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992; Lally, 2000). Apparently, thinking in the L1 leads to more elaborate content and greater risk-taking, while thinking in the L2 produces more accurate language. Private speech in the L1 in problem-solving contexts has also been found by other researchers (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Scott & De La Fuente, 2008; Tomlinson, 2000) and has been interpreted as evidence which supports the claim that resorting to the L1 is a spontaneous cognitive strategy adopted by students even when they are explicitly required to use only the L2 (Scott & De La Fuente, 2008, p. 109).

Moreover, since the L1 encodes the learners’ prior knowledge and is the primary, constitutive part of the learners’ “underlying language proficiency”48 (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009a, p. 5), the L1 can be profitably used to bridge prior knowledge with new content knowledge conveyed in the L2 and new language knowledge about the L2. L1 use, then, can be a scaffolding tool to carry out tasks and make sense of new content and language, especially in the case of students at lower levels of L2 proficiency, dealing with

---

48 This observation is confirmed by studies in the multilingual/ecological perspective. For example, Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005) found that children (mostly 3rd and 4th graders) with L1-Spanish and L2-English switch to their L1 when they “rely on their knowledge of one language to provide a basis for working out the grammar and semantics of the other” (p. 21).
challenging tasks and content. Turnbull, Cormier, and Bourque (2011), for example, examine the students’ use of the L1 in two grade 7 late French immersion classes engaged in science lessons about volcanoes and earthquakes. The lessons were carried out in the L2 by the teacher. However, the students made use of their L1, and that L1 use was associated with greater content complexity in oral utterances about the targeted content and with better results in science knowledge. The researchers therefore conclude that L2 learners may need their L1 in order to manage and articulate greater content complexity.

Arguably, L1 use seems to be related to task type: cognitively demanding tasks and tasks requiring a focus on form seem to trigger L1 use. Furthermore, task type may have a specific impact on the functions of L1 use. For example, in their study of two grade 8 classes, Swain and Lapkin (2000) compared the functions of L1 use between students engaged in a dictogloss task and students engaged in a picture-based jigsaw task. The researchers found that the students engaged in the dictogloss task made greater use of the L1 to understand the story they listened to. The story was delivered orally in the L2 and the students resorted to their L1 to make sense of it. On the other hand, the students engaged in the jigsaw task had fewer issues in understanding the story, but made greater use of the L1 for vocabulary searches, since no vocabulary was provided through the pictures.

Note that L1 use is a practice that holds across different age groups: children (Behan & Turnbull, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Turnbull et al., 2011), high school students (Brooks & Donato, 1994) and college students (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Scott & De La Fuente, 2008; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996) all resort to their L1 and seem to
benefit in their final task performance from using their L1 in the preparation phase. The main benefit derives from the use of the L1 as a scaffolding tool in task management and information sharing (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Wannagat, 2007), and in focusing the students’ attention on form (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Scott & De La Fuente, 2008; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000), while providing them with the metalinguistic terms they might need to understand the meaning and functions of new linguistic structures (Scott & De La Fuente, 2008). I will now turn to an illustration of some examples.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.14 (Anton & Di Camilla, 1998:328) shows the use of the L1 (i.e., English) for task management purposes. Spanish (L2) expressions are italicized.

**FIGURE 2.14 – TASK MANAGEMENT**

1 S: um … *en la ciudad* … um … you want to say *mexico city* in the city

2 is a big city with lots of people?

3 *hay muchas personas?* there are many people?

4 D: okay.

5 S: or in *mexico city* … let’s just say *mexico city* is a big city with a lot of people, is that okay?

6 D: yeah.

7 S: i don’t want to tell you what to say, i just thought.

8 D: no, i don’t know what else to say … there’s more i want to say, i just can’t, we haven’t learned it …

Here the students are working on a collaborative writing task regarding a trip to Mexico. The L1 is used to decide what they want to say (lines 1-7) and to make some metacommments about the task itself and the difficulties associated with it (lines 8-10).

---

49 For a similar observation, see Mori (2004), a researcher working within the interactional perspective: the L1 seems to be “the unmarked code for talk that deals with metatask [and] metalanguage” (p. 541).
Note that Swain and Lapkin (2000, p. 258) include in the task management category also those instances in which students try to develop an understanding of stories. Such instances too, in fact, serve the purpose of moving the task along. The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.15 is an example of this practice. The students work on a common interpretation of a picture in the jigsaw task and they do so in their L1 (i.e., English). French (L2) expressions are italicized.

**FIGURE 2.15 – DEVELOPING A COMMON UNDERSTANDING**

1. J1: oh, i think i know, she likes this guy maybe.
2. J2: well, maybe. wow! *en tout cas.* *at any rate.*

Instances like those represented in Figures 2.14 and 2.15 show how the L1 can be used to establish and maintain mutual understanding, in order to set and meet common goals, and to develop a “shared perspective” on a task (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 255). In other words, as Anton and Di Camilla (1998) put it, the participants use the L1 “to create a social and cognitive space, an intangible workplace, in which the students are able to provide each other with help throughout the task” (p. 328). In these cases, L1 use aids the manageability and completion of a task, while also setting “a positive cooperative tone to the activity” (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 255), thereby allowing for collaborative dialogue. And it is through collaborative dialogue that the students co-construct their L2 and their knowledge about it (Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). As a matter of fact, in their study of L1 use in consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks, Scott and De La Fuente (2008) found that, if college students are prevented from using their L1, they collaborate less effectively and their contribution to the task is typically unbalanced.
But L1 use may have other functions too, as shown in the following fragments: the L1 is used when the students focus their attention on the language itself. In the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.16 (Anton & Di Camilla, 1998, p. 325), for example, the participants frame problematic L2 forms in the L1 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 259). Spanish (L2) expressions are italicized.

FIGURE 2.16 – FOCUSING ON GRAMMAR
1 R: um ... how do you say lunch?
2 T: almuer ... almuer ... zamos ... we eat lunch
3 R: oh ... comemos ... oh
4 T: what do you want to say?
5 R: almuerzos?
6 T: we eat lunch ... almuer ... zamos.
7 R: it's not ... it's a-l-m-u-r?
8 T: yeah.
9 R: now you don't change the zamos to er though?
10 T: right. it's almuer ... almuerzar.
11 R: how do you say almuerzo? a-l-m-u-e-r-z-o?
12 T: yeah ... that's i eat lunch.
13 R: how do you say we ... almor ... it’s almorzamos.
14 T: oh.
15 R: it’s o to ue remember? so we keep it to the o.
16 make sense?
17 T: okay. you’re so smart.

In this fragment, the students are working on the Spanish equivalent of we eat lunch. They produce a series of different L2 forms: from almuerzamos (lines 2 and 6) to almuerzos (line 5) to the final (and accurate) almorzamos (line 13). The L1, on the other hand, provides the metalinguistic framework with which the participants elaborate on their line of reasoning. Here, then, the L1 is used as a scaffolding tool that aids the participants in producing the correct form.

Now, regarding vocabulary, students may carry out word searches in their L1, as in Figure 2.17 (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 259). French (L2) expressions are italicized.

FIGURE 2.17 – FOCUSING ON VOCABULARY
1 J1: et elle est tickelée. how do you say tickled?
   and she is tickled.
FIGURE 2.17 (cont.)

2 J2: chatouillée.
tickled.

3 J1: okay. chatouillée, chatouillée. how do you say foot?
tickled, tickled.

4 J2: le pied.
the foot.

5 J1: ah, chatouillée les pieds.
tickled the feet.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.18 (Anton & Di Camilla, 1998, p. 322), on the other hand, represents a more complex case. Anton and Di Camilla (1998) interpret this as an example of how the L1 is used as a cognitive, scaffolding tool, in that it mediates the activity of learners who are experiencing a problem in accessing an L2 item. Specifically, in this case the learners use the L1 to work on an alternative formulation and therefore solve the present issue. Spanish (L2) expressions are italicized. In this fragment, the participants are writing a text about the eating habits of Americans.

FIGURE 2.18 – EXPRESSING ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS

1 G: i don’t know the word for snack…
2 D: um...
3 G: oh, so you just say in the afternoon?
4 D: we we could … in the afternoon.
5 G: so what time in the afternoon?
6 D: um...
7 G: or do you want to just say in the afternoon?
8 D: let’s say...

9 G: por la tarde?
in the afternoon?

10 D: let’s just do por … la tarde ...
in … the afternoon …

11 G: por la tarde … comen … what do they eat?
in the afternoon … they eat …

12 D: um … frutas.
fruit.

13 G: comen frutas …
they eat fruit …
In line 1 G announces his lack of knowledge of the Spanish equivalent of *snack*. The students then use the L1 to elaborate a periphrastic formulation to describe the concept of *snack*: in the afternoon Americans eat fruit. This formulation is then translated into Spanish (*por la tarde comen frutas*, “in the afternoon they eat fruit”, lines 9-13).

Finally, the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.19 (Anton & Di Camilla, 1998, p. 327) illustrates the strategy of translation into the L1: the students translate an L2 sentence into their L1 to make sure that it conveys the intended meaning. Spanish (L2) expressions are italicized.

**FIGURE 2.19 – TRANSLATION INTO THE L1**

1. S: *para … un … postre es … popular …*  
   *for a dessert (it) is popular*

2. *comer … helado.*  
   *to eat ice cream.*

3. D: now, what are you trying to say?  
4. S: um … for dessert it’s popular to eat ice cream.  
5. D: is that what you said?  
6. S: no…  
7. D: that was right, you’re right…  
8. S: *para un postre.*  
9. D: *for dessert.*  
10. S: ummm hmmm … *es popular…*  
11. D: it’s popular.  
12. S: *comer el helado.*  
13. D: *to eat ice cream.*  
15. D: now, read it again?  
16. S: *para un postre es popular comer el helado.*  
   *for a dessert it is popular to eat ice cream.*  
17. D: okay, is that it?

In this fragment too, the students are writing about eating habits in the US. S produces a sentence directly in Spanish (*para un postre es popular comer helado*, “for a dessert it is popular to eat ice cream” in line 1). The participants then switch to English in order to evaluate the Spanish formulation and to determine that it expresses the intended meaning. To this end, S translates the whole sentence in English (line 4); then, to determine the
exact equivalence of the two sentences, S breaks down the sentence in phrases (*para un postre*, line 8; *es popular*, line 10; *comer el helado*, line 12), while D provides the translation for each phrase (*for dessert*, line 9; *it’s popular*, line 11; *to eat ice cream*, line 13). The whole sentence is finally read aloud by S (line 16) and its accuracy is confirmed by D (line 17).

To sum up, researchers inspired by sociocultural theory tend to emphasize how the “L1 is used as a powerful tool of semiotic mediation between learners […] and within individuals” (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998, p. 315): the L1 is a semiotic tool that allows for effective collaboration in task completion and mediates thinking. In other words, L1 use is a crucial cognitive strategy to which students try to resort even when it is explicitly forbidden. Researchers in this perspective, then, come to the same conclusion as researchers in the multilingual/ecological perspective: L1 use in the L2 classroom should be allowed and it should be based on an informed understanding of its benefits (Scott & De La Fuente, 2008, p. 110), that is, on a theory of optimal L1 use (Macaro, 2005, p. 81).

### 2.4.4 The interactional perspective


Relying on the tenets of CA, the interactional perspective interprets codeswitches within the local interactional situation and its sequential organization, in light of the participants’ contingent needs and purposes. This means that considerations of conversation-external, macro-social factors are not presupposed as crucial for the
as Alfonzetti (1998) says, “codeswitching can, but need not, call into play the social and symbolic values of the codes in the repertoire” (p. 180) of a speaker within a certain speech community.

The aim of CA studies of language alternation is to discover “the orderliness of language choice […] as an activity in its own right” (Gafaranga, 2005:291-292). Since language alternation occurs in conversation – that is, within “an organisation of action that is implemented on a turn-by-turn basis” (Wei, 2005:387) – conversation analysts elaborate a sequential definition of language alternation and CS. That is, instances of language change have to be interpreted in the context of the preceding turn and in terms of the consequences for language choice in the following turn (Gafaranga, 2009, p. 121).

At the same time, the orderliness of language alternation patterns has to be identified against a scheme of interpretation that allows us to distinguish what is normative from what is deviant. In other words, participants and analysts need to base their local analyses of current language choices on a normativity criterion; that is, a criterion of preference that organizes the participants’ local interpretation of prior turns at talk and their formulation of subsequent turns. Auer (1988, 1995) identified this criterion with the preference for same language talk, later reformulated by Gafaranga (2000) as the preference for same medium talk. More specifically, each conversation has a base language; i.e., a preferred medium, that can either be monolingual or bilingual. This preference represents the background against which language choice is identified.

---

50 For a discussion of issues of CS as an index of social identity see: Auer, 2005; Gafaranga, 2005.

51 Note that preference here is to be intended in its technical CA sense. It refers to “observable regularities” (Sidnell, 2010, p. 77) in the talk of coparticipants (and not to their psychological states).
and interpreted (Gafaranga, 2009, p. 123) as normative or deviant (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 14).

Finally, a CA approach to language alternation analyzes language choices from an *emic perspective*. As we have already seen, such a perspective is based on what the participants themselves orient to as relevant and normative on a moment-by-moment basis. In contrast, if one adopts an *etic* perspective (which is based on the analysts’ a priori theoretical formulations of a particular phenomenon), any occurrence of language alternation can be interpreted as an instance of CS. But, as Gafaranga and Torras (2002) point out, “since analysts’ knowledge of the world need not correspond to the reality participants themselves orient to while talking, any account based on that knowledge may turn out to be ‘ironical’” (p. 11). Thus, by adopting an emic perspective — according to which language choices are interpreted in terms of what the participants orient to as relevant in the local context of talk (Wei, 2005, p. 382) — it is possible to identify various categories of language alternation. And not all of them can be classified as CS (see below).

As Gafaranga and Torras (2002, pp. 3-4) observe, bilinguals may ordinarily interact in one language only, with a monolingual medium of interaction, or in two languages, with a bilingual medium of interaction. In the latter case, the participants do not orient to the two languages as different, and language alternation can occur both turn-internally and turn-externally. For example, in the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.20 (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 4), the participants use Kinyarwanda–French as their bilingual medium of interaction while talking about the mistakes made by the Rwandese authorities during the war period (1990-1994). In the fragment, French is italicized.

---

52 Kinyarwanda is the indigenous language spoken by Rwandese people.
FIGURE 2.20 – BILINGUAL MEDIUM OF INTERACTION

1 A: bo bata bataye ubutaka bwabo (.) bazarwana
   they who have lost their land will fight
2 [avec
   [with
3 B: [pour pour reconquérir leurs terres
   [so as to reconquer their land
4 A: voilà (.) ubwo ba ba barecruta abajeunes ibihumbi bitatu
   that’s right (.) they recruited three thousand youth

In line 1, A starts his turn in Kinyarwanda, then switches to French in line 2. B
then initiates, in French, a collaborative completion of A’s turn in overlap with A’s talk
(line 3). In line 4, A expresses agreement with B with French voilà (“that’s right”), while
the remaining part of the turn is formulated both in French and Kinyarwanda. As
Gafaranga and Torras (2002) notice, “if one adopted a language-blind observer’s attitude,
nothing particularly noteworthy at the level of language choice would be observed” (p.
4). In other words, language alternation is not oriented to as either noticeable or deviant
by the participants, which leads to conclude that the medium of this conversation is
bilingual, with Kinyarwanda and French being the base codes: language alternation itself
is the medium of interaction. Cases like these are not considered as instances of CS
(Gafaranga, 2000, 2009; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002).

There are nonetheless cases where the participants orient to language alternation
as deviant. Two courses of action may be pursued in these instances: (a) the participants
orient to language alternation as repairable and perform a repair operation on it (called
medium repair by Gafaranga, 2000, 2009); (b) the participants orient to language
alternation as functional and therefore not needing repair. Case (b) is what Gafaranga
(2000, 2009) and Gafaranga and Torras (2002) refer to as codeswitching. Crucially, this
definition is based on the participants’ local interpretation of language choices: it is an emic definition of CS.

An example of medium repair is illustrated in Figure 2.21 (Gafaranga, 2000, p. 337). Three different languages are used: Kinyarwanda, French (in italics), and German (in bold).

**FIGURE 2.21 – MEDIUM REPAIR**

1 A: kwenregistra umwan n’ ibiki (.l) byose kugirango donc (.l)
   registering the child etc. all that so that

2 abone amafaranga donc kugirango (unclear) (.l)
   she receives the money well so that

3 bon (laughter) njya muri ntuza (.l) muri za ministères (.)
   so i went to something to the ministry departments

4 muri (.l) sozialamt (.) donc ni kimwe
   to the social welfare office well it’s like

5 B: ministère des affaires sociales
   ministry of social affairs

6 A: oya (.l) ni service en fait ntabwo ari ministère
   no in fact it’s an office it’s not a ministry

In this fragment, the participants – all Rwandese refugees – are talking about social assistance. A, who lives in Germany, mentions that he went to the local social welfare office to register his child. The micropause, the repetitions (muri), and the marker ntuza in lines 3-4 all indicate that a word search is underway. The first attempted solution is French ministères (“ministry departments”, line 3), but it is not deemed appropriate, as indicated by the fact that A immediately offers an alternative solution with German Sozialamt (“social welfare office”, line 4). At this point, though, A initiates a reformulation of this solution (dönz ni kimwe, “well it’s like”, line 4), which is then offered by B in French (ministère des affaires sociales, “ministry of social affairs”, line 5). The participants’ behavior shows that they orient to Kinyarwanda-French as their
bilingual medium of interaction, while German is oriented to as a different code that is not acceptable in the current interaction and thus needs to be repaired via a process of translation into one of the medium languages (Gafaranga, 2000, p. 338). A CA analysis of this fragment thereby identifies patterns and categories of language alternation (i.e., Kinyarwanda-French versus Kinyarwanda-French and German) “on the basis of how they [the participants] have reacted to language alternation while talking” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 11).

While medium repair has the effect of restoring the normative medium of interaction (be it monolingual or bilingual, as in Figure 2.21), CS is considered as an interactionally motivated deviance, serving a specific interactional function: it is a case of “interactional otherness” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 12), which does not need to be repaired. According to Gafaranga and Torras (2002), there are two types of CS: medium suspension (i.e., language alternation leading to a temporal suspension of current medium) and medium switching (i.e., a bid for a new medium).

Medium suspension is a case of interactional otherness where language alternation between the current medium of interaction and language X is not oriented to as a repairable, nor does it lead to change the medium of interaction itself. The fragment reproduced in Figure 2.22 (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, pp. 8-9) is an example of this case of codeswitching. The medium of interaction is Kinyarwanda-French (French is italicized), while Swahili (in bold) is the alternating language.

**FIGURE 2.22 – CODESWITCHING: MEDIUM SUSPENSION**

1  A: ubu rero ab       (.) buretse       (.)
   now zairians zair wait a minute

2  abazayuruwa bagiye gutangira ngo (.) fukuza munyarwanda
   zairians are going to start saying kick out rwandese
The participants are three Rwandese refugees in Zaire, who are discussing how the civil war in Zaire might have an impact on their future. Note that Swahili is one of the languages spoken in Zaire. Here, language alternation to Swahili is limited to the expression *fukuza munyarwanda* (“kick out Rwandese”, line 2), which is what Zairians might say about the Rwandese. In other words, A uses language alternation to mark reported speech. Evidence for this interpretation comes from the fact that A does not repair the expression in Swahili, nor does he show an orientation to enforce Swahili as the new medium of interaction. If this were the case, in fact, since B replies in Kinyarwanda-French (line 3), in line 4 A could have reissued his invitation to switch to Swahili by using that language. Instead, he laughs and starts a new turn in Kinyarwanda. And then again, after C’s turn in Kinyarwanda-French (line 5), all the participants laugh (line 6), without displaying any orientation to switching the medium of interaction. Therefore, in cases like this, language alternation only affects the local order of talk by simply producing “a temporal suspension of current medium” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 18).

On the other hand, the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.23 (Gafaranga, 2009, p. 122) is an example of medium switching; i.e., a case of interactional otherness where language alternation between the current medium of interaction and language X does lead
to a switch to language X. The interaction starts off in Catalan (italicized in the transcript) and continues in Spanish.

FIGURE 2.23 – CODESWITCHING: MEDIUM SWITCHING

1 RECI: bon dya seniorea  
    good morning madam

2 EN: mire quería hacer una pregunta   ... a ver ...  
    I would like to ask you a question   let’s see

3 para inscribir al niño al instituto de aquí?  
    to register my son at the school here?

4 RECI: directamente al instituto. ...  
    directly at the school

5 está empadronado aquí el chico?  
    is the boy registered here?

The interaction occurs at a town hall reception in Barcelona. The receptionist initiates the conversation by greeting the approaching enquirer in Catalan (line 1). The enquirer, however, does not return the greeting and directly proceeds to formulate her question in Spanish (lines 2-3). The enquirer’s language change prompts the receptionist to switch to Spanish as well (lines 4-5). This fragment is actually an instance of implicit language negotiation (Auer, 1995; Torras, 1998): the greeting in Catalan sets the norm for the use of Catalan in the following stretch of talk. The deviant use of Spanish in the following turn is thereby noticeable and is interpreted by the receptionist as an implicit request to use Spanish instead of Catalan. This interpretation is based on the sequential order of the conversation. More specifically, the receptionist’s switch to Spanish in lines 4-5 shows how she interpreted the use of Spanish in lines 2-3 against her use of Catalan in line 1. In cases like this, then, language alternation affects the overall order of talk, by producing a switch to a new medium of interaction.

In CA studies on CS, another distinction is considered important: that between discourse-related and participant-related CS. Discourse-related switches mark the
boundary between functionally different speech activities (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009, p. 137), based on different interactional footings\(^5\) (Auer, 1998, p. 8). On the other hand, when participant-related CS occurs, code choices are related to the interlocutors’ preferences, motivated either by ease of production and comprehension or by identity-related reasons. As Auer (1998) points out,

> [...] the basic difference is that, in discourse-related switching, participants search for an account for “why that language now?” [...], while in participant-related switching, they search for an account within the individual who performs this switching, or his or her coparticipants. (p. 8)

For example, the fragment in Figure 2.22 above is an instance of discourse-related CS, structuring the organization of talk: the use of Swahili marks the production of reported speech. On the other hand, the fragment in Figure 2.23 could be interpreted as an instance of participant-related CS. The enquirer’s turn in Spanish displays her preference for that language, while the receptionist’s subsequent switch to Spanish acknowledges and complies with this preference. Since no ethnographic information is provided about the participants in Figure 2.23, it is impossible to determine whether the preference for Spanish is determined by ease of production and comprehension in that language or by identity-related reasons (i.e., the enquirer is Castilian).

On the contrary, for the fragment reproduced in Figure 2.24 (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, pp. 5-6), it is possible to speculate a preference motivated by identity reasons. The languages at play are Spanish and English (in italics).

FIGURE 2.24 – PARTICIPANT-RELATED CODESWITCHING

1 C: una pinta de scrumpy
   one pint of scrumpy

\(^5\) For the notion of footing see Goffman (1981).
The interaction takes place in an Irish pub in Barcelona. The participants are two customers of Anglo-Saxon origin (A and B) and a Spanish bar attendant (C). Here, talk involving the bar attendant is conducted in Spanish (lines 1-3 and 11-12), while the interaction between the two customers is done in English (lines 4-10). The switch to English is determined by the participants’ preference to use this language, a preference which in turn may be motivated by the fact that they share the same ethnicity and the same L1. At the same time, one could say that the participants’ language choices organize the talk in such a way that the use of English characterizes the interaction between the customers, while the use of Spanish characterizes the interaction between the customer and the bar attendant. From this point of view, the fragment in Figure 2.24 may also be interpreted as an instance of discourse-related CS. As Auer (1998) observes, “discourse- and participant- (preference-) related switching are not strictly separated” (p. 8). The importance of identifying a clear distinction between discourse-related and participant-related CS is discussed further in Chapter 5, when I deal with instances of CS in the L2 classroom.
In conclusion, CA studies of CS adopt a sequential definition of this phenomenon and interpret it from an emic perspective. Depending on the sequential environment and on the normativity criterion (i.e., the medium of interaction) that is adopted in a specific stretch of talk, participants show different local interpretations of their language choices. These interpretations allow the analyst to identify different categories of language alternation, categories that emerge from the interaction itself.
Chapter 3: Description of the study

3.1 Data collection: participants, setting and procedure

Participants were four groups of American college students of Italian as a foreign language at a US research university; the total number of participants was 14. Two groups of students (groups A and B) were enrolled in ITAL 103, a third semester, content-based course, while the other two groups (groups C and D) were enrolled in ITAL 310, a sixth semester, advanced grammar class.

The groups’ composition is illustrated in Table 3.1 below; the students’ names are pseudonyms to protect the participants’ identities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITAL 103</th>
<th>ITAL 310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, Lucy, Mary</td>
<td>Annie, Craig, Donny, Kitty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily, Jenny</td>
<td>Andy, David, Lucio, Marta, Roberta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Groups’ composition

It is not possible to determine the exact level of proficiency of the participants, since no standardized measure was used. However, being the instructor for groups A, C, and D, I can at least say that the 103 students in group A performed above 80% in assignments, tests, and exams and their skills seemed comparable. On the other hand, the students in 310 showed greater variation in their proficiency level, ranging from advanced (e.g., Lucio, a heritage speaker, and Roberta) to low intermediate (e.g., David). They also performed differently in tests and exams, ranging from 60% to 100%.

The ITAL 103 data were collected in the Fall semester of 2008, while the ITAL 310 data were collected in the Spring semester of 2012. All the students met three to four
times\textsuperscript{54} in a university office in order to plan together a group presentation to be performed during regular class time in front of their classmates. Each planning session lasted 30-50 minutes.

In the meetings, the students were free to interact in whichever language they preferred. The rationale for this choice was that the planning sessions should be moments of independent work for the students, and as close as possible to moments of autonomous work at home or in another setting. For the same purpose, the researcher was not present during the sessions, but was available to answer questions at the end of each session. It is important to emphasize, in fact, that in both these classes the students are expected to conduct their planning work outside the classroom.

In the specific instructional context where this study was set up, classroom presentations are a regular, graded assignment in ITAL 103. Specifically, each student is required to perform three presentations per semester, each lasting three minutes. In this class, presentations are prepared either individually or in groups, depending on the teachers’ and, occasionally, on the students’ own preferences. But, whether a student worked on the presentation by herself or with a partner, she receives a grade based on her individual performance.

In more advanced classes (such as ITAL 310), the decision to insert presentations as components of the students’ final grade lies with the instructor who is teaching the class in a specific semester. For the section of ITAL 310 taught in Spring 2012, the students were indeed required to give a group presentation, where each student would talk for three to five minutes. In this case too, each student received a grade based on her

\textsuperscript{54} The set up for the study required only three planning sessions. However, the participants in group C decided to meet a fourth time and agreed to have their last session videotaped as well.
individual performance. A description of presentation topics and grading criteria will be provided in sections 3.2 and 3.3 below.

The IRB committee that approved data collection in 2008 required that the presentations prepared by the participants in the study would not be graded. The students in groups A and B thereby agreed to perform an extra presentation (in addition to the ones required by the syllabus), albeit still following the usual requirements for presentations as described in the ITAL 103 syllabus. On the other hand, the IRB committee that examined the project in 2012 approved the plan of having participants (i.e., students in groups C and D) meet to prepare the classroom presentation that counted as a component of their final grade.

Both the planning sessions and the classroom presentations were videotaped with one or two digital cameras. At first, words-only transcripts for each session were created. Then, relevant fragments were selected for analysis and transcribed following standard CA conventions (as described by Jefferson in Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). In the fragments reported in the dissertation, focal elements in the discussion are in boldface, while words in Italian are italicized. When Italian is used, a word-by-word translation is typically provided in the second line, followed by a more idiomatic translation in the third line. Although gestures and bodily postures are not the focal concern of this study, information about the participants’ nonverbal conduct will be included whenever relevant for the analysis. Nonverbal conduct is transcribed in Italics in double parentheses, and its co-occurrence with talk is marked by the use of a square bracket.

In the analysis, Learning Behavior Tracking (LBT) – a CA-based methodology elaborated by Markee (2008, 2011) – will be used: (a) to track the moment-by-moment
creation and development of collaboratively written artifacts; and (b) to document the practices enacted by the participants in the process of shaping the emergent artifacts. LBT is a longitudinal approach used in CA analyses applied to the field of second language studies. It is based on two techniques: learning object tracking and learning process tracking. Learning object tracking follows a learning object as it is oriented to by coparticipants over a period of time, while learning process tracking shows how students engage in language learning behavior both in the moment and over time.

3.2 Presentation topics

All groups were instructed to use their planning time in order to agree on a topic, assign subtopics to individual presenters, plan an outline of the presentation, rehearse, and give feedback to each other. Once a common topic was established, each member was responsible for presenting one aspect of it. Students in 103 were supposed to give a three minute presentation each, whereas students in 310 had to present for three to five minutes. Finally, regarding the format of the presentation, students in 103 in 2008 were not required to create a Power Point presentation, but were encouraged to use some visual material (e.g., pictures, charts, maps, etc.) and to show it with an overhead projector. However, by 2012 Power Point was regularly utilized for classroom instruction and the students in 310 were required to use it for their presentation.

In terms of topics, the students in 103 were asked to choose a topic that would be compatible with the content of the course; i.e., the physical and social geography of Italy. On the other hand, the students in 310 were instructed to give a presentation about one aspect of student life in Italy. This topic was chosen because the students in 310, besides looking for relevant information online, had the opportunity to interact with Italian
students enrolled in an exchange program. At the time of data collection in 2012, the Italian students were in Italy and were due to arrive in the US three months later. The American students thus communicated with the Italian students via Facebook. More specifically, the Italian students created a Facebook group and the American students joined it. The purpose was twofold: 1) giving students in 310 the opportunity to communicate with L1 speakers of Italian about matters of interest to them and about topics to be covered in two task assignments (see below); 2) giving Italian students the opportunity to make friends with fellow students they might meet upon arrival in the US and to ask them questions about life on campus.

In ITAL 310 two tasks required interaction with the Italian students. As mentioned above, the presentation had to illustrate an aspect of student life in Italy. After the presentation, the students had to prepare a final project where they would describe aspects of college life in the US. The final project was designed in response to questions that the Italian students had or might have about life on an American campus. In the instructor’s plan, the two tasks were supposed to be connected. In fact, the information about student life in Italy could help the American students to tailor their final project for the Italian students. In this way, by knowing something about how students live in Italy, the students in 310 might more easily imagine which aspects of campus life in the US would have more impact on the Italians and would thereby be worth emphasizing in the final project.

Next I will discuss what the students decided to do in their presentation. A schematic summary of each group’s topic and subtopics is illustrated in Table 3.2 below. The students in group A decided to talk about Italian dining and to frame their
presentation within an imaginary setting: they would pretend to be waiters and waitresses serving food in a restaurant. They also agreed on the following outline:

- a common introduction to their imaginary restaurant named *Pasta Hut*;
- a section with individual presentations;
- another common part where they would present the structure of an Italian meal as a restaurant menu and would conclude by serving dessert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITAL 103</th>
<th>ITAL 310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A: Italian food</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group C: Free time and Study Abroad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Italian American restaurants in the US (Lucy)</td>
<td>- Italian academic calendar (Craig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of restaurants in Italy (John)</td>
<td>- Popular travel destinations for young Italians (Donny)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Italian dining etiquette (Mary)</td>
<td>- Visits to students at other universities (Annie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B: Carnival in Venice</strong></td>
<td>- Study Abroad in Italy (Kitty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Description of Carnival and its origins (Emily)</td>
<td><strong>Group D: The Italian school system</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carnival food, puppet shows, and masks (Jenny)</td>
<td>- Italian school structure (Lucio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fields of study (Marta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Classes and workload (Roberta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exams (Andy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher-student relationships (David)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Presentation topics

The other groups, on the other hand, agreed on a simpler structure for their presentation. Students in group B focused on Carnival in Venice, with Emily giving a description of this tradition and its origins, and Jenny talking about Carnival food, puppet shows, and masks.

Students in group C had a hard time settling on a topic (which is probably why they decided to meet four times instead of three), but eventually decided to talk about how students spend their free time in Italy and about various study abroad programs.
Craig was to start with an illustration of the academic calendar, followed by Donny’s presentation on popular travel destinations for young Italians; then Annie talked about visits to students attending other universities in different cities, while Kitty described some of the study abroad programs in Italy offered by their American university.

Finally, students in group D chose the Italian school system as their general topic. Lucio illustrated the Italian school structure and showed a Skype interview with a friend of his on this subtopic; Marta touched on the curriculum organization and the variety of fields of study that a student could take at an Italian university; Roberta talked about students’ schedules, classes, and workload, while Andy described how exams are conducted; finally, David presented on the relationship between teachers and students in Italian universities.

3.3 Classroom presentations: syllabus and teachers’ expectations

3.3.1 Presentations in ITAL 103

A schematic summary of the grading criteria in ITAL 103 and 310 is illustrated in Table 3.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITAL 103</th>
<th>ITAL 310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness: 35 points</td>
<td>Content: 20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility: 30 points</td>
<td>Comprehensibility: 20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to attract attention: 15 points</td>
<td>Communicative effectiveness: 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary: 15 points</td>
<td>Vocabulary: 15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency: 2.5 points</td>
<td>Organization: 15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation: 2.5 points</td>
<td>Accuracy of slides: 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style of the ppt: 10 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Grading criteria

Craig was in fact absent on the day of the presentation. Donny covered his slides.
The evaluation criteria in ITAL 103 are as follows: preparedness (35 points), comprehensibility (30 points), ability to attract other students’ attention (15 points), vocabulary (15 points), fluency (2.5 points), pronunciation (2.5 points), for a total of 100 points. Each presentation is worth 5% of the final grade.

Some of the grading criteria are briefly glossed in the syllabus. Specifically, preparedness means “development of topic in allotted time”, while the criterion referring to the ability to attract other students’ attention also includes the ability to generate a discussion and elicit a reaction from the audience. Finally, students receive points for vocabulary if the words they choose are accurate and appropriate, while points for fluency are given based on the “smoothness of speech”, and points for pronunciation are given if students display an “Italian-like ’accent’”.

Students are advised to check the evaluation criteria illustrated in the syllabus and, more specifically, to “pay particular attention to the heavy weighting of comprehensibility and preparedness” (see below). Moreover, the use of pictures and other visuals is highly recommended in order to enhance the comprehensibility and the level of interest of their presentations. In fact, an important factor that students should take into account is that “the instructor's rating of a student's presentation is always influenced by the other students' reactions to it”. This means that the presentations should be interesting enough to attract other students’ attention. At the same time, those who listen to the presentations are advised to ask questions and take notes.

Note also how, on the online learning management system for the course and in the syllabus, students are given some tips on how to prepare for their presentations. First of all, it is emphasized that presentations have the double purpose of allowing students to
demonstrate both their language skills and their knowledge of the subject matter. It is then explicitly stated that students cannot read their presentations. They are only allowed to have an outline that will help them to remember the main points and content of their presentation. Quoting from the syllabus: “Oral presentations are precisely that: ORAL. Although you may want to prepare a simple outline for yourself, the reading of notes/text will not be accepted as an oral presentation”. This wording clearly shows the instructors’ conceptualization of the task as essentially oral, while – as it will be shown in the analytical chapters – for all the students a presentation includes a crucial written component; i.e., a script.

3.3.2 Presentations in ITAL 310

A description of the evaluation criteria in ITAL 310 was posted on the online learning management system used for that class. The criteria include: content (20 points), organization (15 points), communicative effectiveness (10 points). Then, in terms of the language used during the oral performance, 20 points are given for comprehensibility and 15 for vocabulary. Finally, students receive 10 points for slides with accurate spelling and grammar, and another 10 points for the style of the PowerPoint. The maximum score is thus 100 points. The presentation is worth 10% of the students’ final grade.

All the criteria are briefly glossed in the file posted online. Specifically, it is stated that the presentation must convey accurate and relevant information (content) and that the content has to be organized in a logical, clear, and linear fashion (organization). Communicative effectiveness is constructed in terms of how well the presentation is performed, and involve criteria such as good eye contact, confidence, good use of
pointing, ability to engage the audience. Points for comprehensibility are given if the students are accurate enough in grammar and pronunciation so that eventual mistakes do not hinder comprehension, while vocabulary needs to be rich and appropriate. Finally, the style of the presentation is assessed in terms of the effectiveness of the Power Point file as a visual support (i.e., whether the slides are clear enough, do not contain too much information, etc.).

The syllabus also states the purpose of the presentation: it is included as a graded assignment so that students can practice their ability to present content of interest to them in an effective and accurate way. Lastly, in an oral discussion of the assignment, students were advised not to read their notes, although they were allowed to bring them to class and glance at them during the presentation.
Chapter 4: The collaborative production of emergent artifacts

4.1 Introduction

As already noted in Chapter 2, from a behavioral, process-oriented perspective, planning is defined as an “imaginative and discursive practice” (Suchman, 2007, p. 13), as “a form of culturally and historically situated activity, manifest in specific practices and associated artifacts” (Suchman, 2007, p. 187). The students participating in my research project did indeed produce various material artifacts (e.g., notes, written scripts, Power Point presentations, Facebook posts), which emerge in the course of three (or four) planning sessions and in the individual planning time that the students spent to prepare for their presentations. The collaborative production of some of these artifacts will be the focus of the present chapter.

In their studies on planning as situated activity, Murphy (2004, 2005) and Roth (1996) focus on the distributed nature of the planning process through which artifacts emerge as “heterogeneous assemblages” (Roth, 1996, p.141), created through the intersection of a variety of resources, and emerging in situ, moment-by-moment, during collaborative group planning. What I will argue here is that the creation of material artifacts for a classroom presentation collaboratively realized by groups of adult L2 learners carries striking similarities to the planning processes described in previous studies.

However, if the planning processes enacted in interactions-for-design and in interactions-for-classroom-tasks are similar, the types of artifacts shaped in these interactions are clearly different. Specifically, interactions-for-design produce drawings and actual objects, such as blue prints, while the typical products of interactions-for-
classroom-tasks are linguistic artifacts, such as the notes, written scripts, Power Point presentations, and Facebook posts produced by the participants in this study. Note that these products may be in written or oral form. Furthermore, they can either be primary products of the planning process (as in the case of Power Point presentations), or merely by-products (such as notes) that emerge as transient aids during the construction of the primary products. Here I will focus on the collaborative production of two specific types of linguistic artifacts: 1) script lines (i.e., artifacts designed to plan what to say in the presentation); and 2) questions to post on Facebook (i.e., artifacts designed to plan what to ask Italian students in order to gather some information to include in the presentation). In their final form, all the artifacts I will examine are formulated in Italian and are written.

The script lines, in particular, typically emerge as instances of hypothetical discourse (HD), that open up an alternative world; i.e., the projected, imaginary stage of the presentation, where the student-planners assume the identity of student-presenters. As they emerge on the interactional, intersubjective stage, the script lines become susceptible to modifications (such as translation, repairs, and extensions) that are collaboratively achieved by the coparticipants.

On the other hand, the Facebook questions do not necessarily emerge as instances of HD, and the work performed on them tends to be conducted individually by the students, either during the first and second planning sessions or at home. For this reason, since the focus of this chapter is on collaborative planning, I will only analyze the single occurrence when the students actually work together on a question that is to be written and posted on the Facebook wall.
The chapter is organized as follows: first, I will review studies on design as a planning activity where artifacts are imagined and produced by participants (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Roth, 1996; Schmidt & Wagner, 2004). Second, I will describe the similarities between the production of design artifacts and the production of linguistic artifacts in interactions-for-classroom-tasks. Third, I will review studies on HD (particularly: Golato, 2012), which are relevant for an analysis of script lines as instances of HD. Finally I will provide a detailed CA analysis of various fragments, during which students produce different artifacts: a transitioning line from one individual presentation to the next (group A); a line introducing the topics of individual presentations (group A); a line representing the first part of an individual presentation (group B); and a question to post on Facebook (group C). At the end of the chapter, I will provide a brief summary of the main findings.

4.2 Artifacts as products of and resources for the planning process

During planning, artifacts emerge as “heterogeneous assemblages” (Roth, 1996, p. 141) that “solidify” (Murphy, 2005, p.118) the emergent form of the planning product: artifacts are assembled with heterogeneous resources, negotiations and actions that ultimately lead to their final shape. Moreover, in each stage of production an artifact embodies both the latest version of the plan and its history, capturing the unfolding design trajectory in solid form.

The nature of these artifacts depends on the institutional setting and on the goal of the task at hand: e.g., in interactions among architects (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Schmidt & Wagner, 2004), artifacts are drawings, while children engaged in learning-through-design

---

56 Note that the participants in group D did not do any collaborative work on the creation of artifacts. See below for further discussion.
activities (Roth, 1996) create engineering projects consisting of towers, bridges, etc. Similarly, in language learning environments, the kind of artifacts that students produce depends on the final task: a presentation, for example, can lead to the production of notes, scripts, and power point slides.

Murphy’s (2004, 2005, 2011, 2012) studies on architectural interaction belong to the line of research focusing on the organization of human action previously discussed in section 2.2.4 (see Goodwin, 2000a, 2013; Streeck et al., 2011). Specifically, in his 2004 and 2005 studies, Murphy focuses on the ideational component of planning, realized through collaborative *imagining*, which is a goal-oriented planning activity accomplished through the collaborative, imaginative effort of a team of architects. In this process, imaginary things (i.e., buildings) are created by participants, who deploy in real time a range of intertwined semiotic resources – including gestures, talk, and drawings – that are publicly accessible and shared in the emerging intersubjective space of laminated talk-in-interaction.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 4.1 (Murphy, 2005, p. 123) is an example of collaborative imagining. Here the architects are working on the plant storage section of the service yard in a new laboratory building. In lines 1-2 Mark suggests that they equip the area with a sliding door made of chain link; George agrees with him (line 3). Mark then places his right hand on the drawing, by the opening of the plant storage section, and moves his hand toward himself, mimicking the action of a sliding door. His gesture, combined with the drawing and the talk (*just let it sli::de back here*, line 4), shows where the door should be located and the direction of its motion. Mark’s gesture also structures

---

57 I thank Keith Murphy for sharing the original image with me.
George’s utterance, delivered in partial overlap with Mark’s talk and suggesting the same backward movement of the imaginary door (*a panel that comes back*, line 5).

**FIGURE 4.1 – SLIDING DOOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Why don’t we have a sliding door there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A sliding chain link door?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>( ) (. ) Sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Just let it sli:: – de back here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>A panel that comes back,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>They can roll it back and lock it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>That’s nice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>“That’s nice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark then slightly lifts his hand and moves it in the opposite direction to indicate the closing of the door. This gesture accompanies the talk in line 6: *they can roll it back and lock it*. George agrees (line 7).

This fragment shows how an imaginary object (i.e., a door) and its motion are created through the combination of different semiotic media: each medium alone would not be as effective (see also the discussion of the fragment in Figure 4.8, section 2.2.4). In fact, the talk alone suggests the creation of a sliding door that moves back, but it does
not exactly indicate where the door would be located and how it would move. The drawing, in turn, visually provides the spatial dimension that anchors the talk. However, it is only the combination of the drawing with the first gesture that disambiguates the referent of the deictic *here* (line 4) in the talk, thereby allowing the participants to imagine the exact door position. At the same time, it is only through the gestures that the motion component is properly illustrated. As Murphy (2005) observes, the meaningful intersection of talk, gestures, and drawings is used to build imaginary things, “to situate [them] in social space and make them publicly available for comment and manipulation” (p. 140).

What is specifically relevant here is that the coparticipants use various resources to collaboratively shape different versions of the plan, which will then be captured in graphic form on the drawings. A similar conclusion is reached by Roth (1996) in his ethnographic study on elementary school children engaged in a learning-through-design curriculum. The students were presented with engineering problems, such as the construction of towers and bridges, to be solved with a given set of tools, materials, and constraints.

Particularly relevant for the present chapter is Roth’s (1996, pp. 140-141) discussion about the self-reflexivity of emergent artifacts. That is, emergent artifacts embody the achievements of past activities and simultaneously constitute the basis of future affordances: the current state of an artifact is the result of past negotiations and actions, but is also the starting point for future negotiations and actions that will take the artifact to its next stage. As Streeck (2011) points out, “states of artifacts retain
memories of local interaction” (p. 67); at the same time, material artifacts are “external, visible, and therefore jointly accessible structure(s)” (p. 73) upon which subsequent action can be performed.

For example, one group of children in Roth’s (1996) study decided to build a tower with a cubic module as its base. The present state of the base was used to imagine a tower modeled after the Tower of London. The children then kept building their tower by adding more cubic modules. In a subsequent design stage, the artifact had stability problems and its unstable state was the basis to discuss whether their tower might look like the Leaning Tower of Pisa. Roth (1996) observes: “at each of the decision points, future design states were discussed in terms of the present artifact and individual prior knowledge, shared prior knowledge, or both” (p. 141).

So, at each stage of their production, emergent artifacts constitute tangible tools for thinking, structuring the children’s engagement with the originally ill-defined engineering problem. In yet another sense, then, emergent artifacts are reflexive: they are the goals of the designing activity, while simultaneously structuring that activity (Roth, 1996, p. 146). Moreover, emergent artifacts anchor the students’ meaning-making practices (talk, gestures), warranting mutual understanding and hence fostering the progressivity of the planning process.

In a similar vein, Schmidt and Wagner (2004) observe that, in a field like architecture, representational artifacts (e.g., drawings, sketches, etc.) constitute successive “objectifications of the construction-in-the-making” (p. 364): artifacts are material products of the planning process. At the same time, according to (Suchman, 2007), by being visible and yet underspecified representations of the real thing, plans-as-

58 For a similar observation, see also Sahlström (2011, p. 59).
artifacts are open to inspection, discussion, and modification. Ultimately, then, artifacts themselves become the immediate object of the architects’ work and actually structure that work.

In this sense, then, emergent, representational artifacts serve as resources for the planning activity: by capturing and materializing the unfolding design trajectory, artifacts embody and make publicly accessible temporary versions of the plan that coparticipants collectively shape using available resources, until the artifacts reach their final form. This process is collaboratively achieved in and through talk-in-interaction.

4.3 Instances of hypothetical discourse as discursive artifacts

As mentioned above, the scripts-as-final-products created by the students in groups A and B are the result of successive elaborations of script lines through which the students imagine, model, and plan what they might say during the presentation. These script lines emerge in the students’ planning talk as instances of hypothetical discourse (HD); i.e., as quotations of what might be said during the presentation. Each script line is itself an artifact used to propose an additional element to the script-so-far and to suggest how it might be realized. Similarly to design artifacts, once a script line emerges in the public, intersubjective space, it becomes available for discussion, modification, approval or rejection by the coparticipants. Each script line thus reaches its final form through collective and collaborative shaping; it is then written, in Italian, in the students’ notebooks, thereby becoming a material objectification (or reification) of a specific part of the plan.

Since HD is a particular kind of represented discourse (RD), a few words on RD are in order here. RD is a demonstrative method of communication (Clark & Gerrig,
1990) involving the use of quotations to illustrate the context where the words being quoted were or could be spoken. A distinctive feature of quotations-as-demonstrations is their inherent illustrative, evidential element (Clift, 2006, 2007; Couper-Kuhlen, 2007). Through various semiotic resources (e.g., language, voice quality, speed of delivery, gestures), RD depicts a setting and what happened or could happen there, thus making it more evidentially visible to coparticipants.

The peculiarity of HD is that it depicts an imaginary setting, a fictitious yet possible world where the words being quoted might be (or might have been) spoken (Golato, 2012). HD may occur both in narrative and non-narrative contexts. In non-narrative contexts, HD typically has a modeling function: the current speaker models what she herself or others might say in a given situation. The modeling may be done for different interactional purposes, like eliciting elaboration or disagreement on a topic (Myers, 1999), giving advice (Golato, 2012), etc. The following is an example of modeling in a non-narrative context in German (Golato, 2012).

FIGURE 4.2 – APOTHEKE HIER!

1 TINI: du musst nu:r bölken ganz ge- laut
   you only have to bellow very loud

2 APOTHEKE HIE::R!
   PHARMACY HE::RE!

3 (.)

4 TINI: irgendwie sowas musste sagn.
   something like that you have to say.

In this extract, Tini and Anne are talking about Anne’s experience as a pharmacist. In prior lines (not reported here), Anne complains about the fact that, when she is put on hold upon calling a doctor’s office, she can overhear delicate conversations between the doctor and his patients. In lines 1-2, then, Tini suggests and demonstrates
what Anne should do in that situation; namely, she should bellow **APOTHEKE HIER!** ("pharmacy here!"). In line 1 Tini gives a description of how Anne should speak (**laut bölen**, "bellow loudly"), while in line 2 she actually demonstrates the words that Anne should say and how she should deliver them (i.e., with increased volume). Finally, note how the modal verb (**du musst**, “you must”) in the quotative frame (line 1) introduces a fictitious scenario where the modeled words should be enacted.

The use of quotative frames is relevant in non-narrative quoting involving HD. For example, in Golato’s (2012) corpus, when HD is used for modeling discourse, a quotative frame (typically a modal verb followed by a verb of saying) explicitly signals that the subsequent HD line is to be interpreted as a model. As Golato (2012) observes, it is through the design of quotative frames that “speakers tend to open up alternative worlds [...] when modeling the discourse of others” (p. 30).

Similarly, in most of my data, HD lines are distinctively introduced via quotative frames characterizing HD lines as models. Moreover, quotative frames indicate whether the current speaker interprets a specific planning action as a collective endeavor (with frames like **do we want to say, we could be like**) to be discussed with coparticipants, or as an individual enterprise, the speaker being the author of a line that she is proposing for herself or for a coparticipant (with frames like **you could be like, I’ll be like**). Finally, quotative frames project different levels of certainty on the current planning action, depending on the format (interrogative versus assertive), on the presence of a modal verb (**you could be like** versus **you say**), on the verb mood (**you could be like** versus **you can say**). The proposed models are therefore introduced as possibilities with various degrees of likelihood, closer to or farther from actual realization.
In sum, in the present dataset, the participants use HD lines to plan and model what they might say in a given moment of the presentation, thereby displaying their orientation to the presentation as a performance. These lines function as illustrative devices through which additional elements to the script-so-far and possible versions of their implementation are proposed.

My aim in the present chapter is to show how HD lines work similarly to drawings and engineering projects, in that they function as depictive devices that illustrate the plan as envisioned by the coparticipants, and make it publicly accessible in the intersubjective space between participants and hence open to modification. These devices are therefore both products of, and resources for, the planning process. In this chapter, then, I will show how script lines emerge in public space and how they are subsequently modified in and through talk-in-interaction.

4.4 Analysis

4.4.1 The artifacts in the present study: written scripts and questions

What I want to argue in this section is that the creation of material linguistic artifacts realized by groups of adult L2 learners engaged in planning a classroom presentation carries striking similarities to the designing processes described above. As mentioned before, this chapter focuses on the collaborative production of specific linguistic artifacts: 1) script lines that constitute a written script for the presentation; and 2) questions posted on Facebook.

Scripts were created by all groups of students, despite the teacher’s conceptualization of the presentation as an essentially oral task (see section 3.3). However, only the students in groups A and B (i.e., the students enrolled in ITAL 103)
actually worked together in the production of these artifacts; therefore, only data from these two groups will be included in the analysis (see sections 4.4.2, 4.4.3, and 4.4.4 below). On the other hand, the questions to post on Facebook were formulated only by the students in groups C and D (i.e., the students enrolled in ITAL 310), who had a chance to interact with Italian students via a Facebook group (see section 3.2). However, the formulation of the questions was mainly carried out as an individual endeavor and only data from group C will be included in the analysis (section 4.4.5).

I will now turn to a discussion of these types of artifacts. To begin with, the scripts emerge – stage by stage – from the interaction among the students and from their engagement with available resources and constraints. Like the design artifacts, then, the scripts are heterogeneous assemblages that are constructed in a laminated fashion, by combining various semiotic resources. The students, in fact, used talk, gestures, online dictionaries, Wikipedia and other online sources, their class notes, their handbook, paper, and pens to create a shared script for an oral presentation that had to be performed in Italian (the students’ L2). Furthermore, each student was supposed to talk for approximately 3-4 minutes (see sections 3.2 and 3.3 for a description of the presentation requirements).

Figures 4.3 and 4.4 below reproduce parts of the scripts created by the students in groups A and B respectively. As the design artifacts, the scripts went through various stages, each embodying past actions and representing the current version of the plan. The script-as-emergent-artifact, then, was a resource for the student-planners, in that each script stage was the starting point for the subsequent negotiations and actions that eventually shaped the script into its final form.
Now, the script-as-final-product does embody the planning trajectory; however, it displays neither the total number of stages it subsumes, nor all the actions performed on the script-as-emergent-artifact. For example, neither Figure 4.3 nor Figure 4.4 document the role of English (the students’ L1) in the formulation of the script lines. Some script lines, in fact, were originally formulated in English and then translated into Italian, while in other cases the participants started to formulate the script lines in Italian, but switched to English upon encountering trouble in their L2 (for the role of the L1 in the production of script lines, see Chapter 5, and Markee & Kunitz, 2013).
Nonetheless, the script-as-final-product may be inscribed with visual traces of the planning process; for example, the deletions visible in Figure 4.3 and the grey areas underlined in Figure 4.4 (which correspond to the erased portions of the script). Such deletions and grey areas materially document that some changes did occur in the process of creating the scripts, while the crossed-out words and letters in Figure 4.3 tangibly record a prior stage of the script-as-emergent-artifact. By comparing the deleted words with the words that replaced them, it is possible to infer the nature of the problems that the students encountered, namely grammar and vocabulary issues in Italian, their L2.

However, the scripts-as-final-products remain uninformative with respect to the practices that the coparticipants enacted to write the script lines and to solve problems as they arose. Unveiling some of those ‘invisible’ practices and illustrating how the students got to the script-as-final-product is precisely the goal of the present chapter.

Similar observations can be made about the questions that the students in groups C and D created and posted on Facebook. However, I do not have access to all the questions-as-final-products. Even if I did, though, the questions-as-artifacts would not carry any visible trace of the repair operations performed on them, since they were typed with a computer (see Figure 4.8). Figures 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 are the only material artifacts I have which document the students’ work on the questions to post on Facebook.

---

59 As mentioned in section 3.2, at the time of data collection, I was teaching ITAL 310 and I decided not to interfere with my students’ interaction with the Italians. I therefore did not join the Facebook group they used to communicate with each other.
### Figure 4.5 Topic and questions (group C, session 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Study Abroad from Italy to other countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- When can you study abroad? When is it normal to study to study abroad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the popular majors to study abroad with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What countries are popular?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is it expensive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do people go with friends or with major?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the program prestigious?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is it popular to study abroad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What languages do you taken classes in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DO you go with the school or private?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ask their friends- other majors and Universities' study abroad programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, the artifact in Figure 4.5 was produced by the ITAL 310 students in group C during the first planning session. It shows that they (temporarily) settled on the topic “study abroad from Italy to other countries” and that they agreed on a series of questions to ask their Italian Facebook friends. The questions are here formulated in
English; content-wise, the questions reveal the type of information that these students deemed relevant in order to do a presentation on the topic that they had agreed on.

Figure 4.6, on the other hand, represents the outline elaborated by this same group during the second planning session and emailed to the teacher/researcher afterwards. Here, the questions-as-artifacts have a double function: they represent questions to be posted on the Facebook wall and, at the same time, they identify the subtopics assigned to individual students. For example, the question “Where are popular destinations for young people” represents what Donny needs to ask to the Italians, and also the type of information he will be covering in his presentation. Further questions related to his main topic are listed below (for example, “How often do you go home?”, etc.)

The artifacts in Figures 4.5 and 4.6 have an organizational function and are important scaffolding tools for the students’ work; i.e., they are what Kirsh (2009) calls “mental aids” (p. 284; see section 2.2.3 in the literature review). Both these artifacts, in fact, are “an inscribed material remembering of the prior activity” (Sahlström, 2011, p. 59), while at the same time embodying a plan for future actions. These artifacts, then, serve the double purpose of remembering agreements reached in the past and remembering what needs to be done next: they are ‘memory aids’ that extend both backward (toward the past interaction) and forward (toward future courses of action). They are then empirical examples of what embedded, socially distributed cognition looks like (see Chapter 2, section 2.2).

While the questions-as-artifacts in Figures 4.5 and 4.6 are the outcome of group discussions over two planning sessions, the artifact in Figure 4.8 is the product of one

---

60 Since I had this outline in a Word format, I was able to replace the students’ actual names with their pseudonyms. Note also that Kitty’s topic changed in the final presentation (see section 3.3).
student in group D, Andy, and it represents the list of Facebook questions he created during individual planning time at home. Note that the warrant for including Figures 4.7 and 4.8 in the analyses in this chapter derives from the fact that these artifacts are talked into relevance by the students themselves during subsequent planning sessions.

### Meeting Minutes

**Presentation**

- **Introduction**
  - Summary of what we will talk about in presentation
- **Italian school structure in general**
  - Pre-high school
  - High School
  - Admission to University
    - How they pick the school
    - Willingness to travel far?
  - University
- **Area/Field of study**
  - Varying curricula
  - Number of years to complete
- **Classes & Workload**
  - Reading/book list
  - Generally no participation
  - Daily assignments not common ??
  - Professors often late to class or don’t show
- **Exams**
  - Oral? Written?
  - Theme?
  - How long?

**Figure 4.7 Part of the presentation outline (group D, session 1)**

During the first planning session the students in group D agreed on the Italian school system as a general topic and created an outline for their presentation. The outline is partially reproduced in Figure 4.7; individual subtopics in this document are color-coded by the participants themselves and Andy is the designated presenter of the subtopic “exams”. At the beginning of the second planning session, Andy declares: “I got a lot of information on my subject”. As it turns out, he created a file called “notes” where he saved: a list of relevant websites; the list of questions he asked an Italian student through
Facebook (Figure 4.8); the list of answers he received; and notes on other information that he got through another person.

| 1.) come gli esami sono diversi fra diversi corse di studia (tipo come gli esami sono diversi fra engineering, marketing, biology, etc...) |
| 2.) come sono diversi fra anno nella scuola (l'esami sono diversi tra primo anno e l'ultimo anno all'università) |
| 3.) se gli esami sono orale or scrittore? (cosa sono la struttura degli esami.) |
| 4.) Quanto tempo si prende per finire un esame normalmente. |
| 5.) Quanti esami hai per una classe normalmente |
| 6.) Se sai altre cose degli esami che pensi devo sapere, dimmelo :) questo informazione è per un grande progetto per mia classe d'italiano! |

Figure 4.8 Questions asked by Andy (group D)

The questions in Figure 4.8 are part of this file and are the outcome of Andy’s individual work, which he completed at home, in the time period between the first two planning sessions. In any case, this artifact – typed with a computer – does not show any trace of possible deletions and reformulations that Andy carried out while writing the questions and nothing can be said about this process.

In conclusion, as the artifacts in Figures 4.5-4.8 demonstrate, the students in groups C and D used planning time to negotiate and agree on the outline for the presentation, but worked in rather different ways about the formulation of the questions to post on Facebook. The students in group D formulated the questions during individual planning time at home; Andy, as shown in Figure 4.8, asked his questions in Italian, but I have no information about the language used by the other students in his group.

61 The following is a translation of the questions listed in Figure 4.7. I tried to give a translation that could be as close as possible to the original. “1.) how are exams different among different courses of study (like how are exams different between engineering, marketing, biology, etc...) 2.) how are exams different in (each) year at school (are exams different between the first year and the last year in college) 3.) whether exams are oral or writings? (which is the structure of exams.) 4.) How long does it take to complete an exam usually. 5.) How many exams per class do you usually have 6.) If you know other things about exams that you think I must know, tell me © This information is for a great project for my Italian class!”
Interestingly, the students in group D did not perform any kind of collaborative work on the production of linguistic artifacts and therefore data from this group will not be included in the present chapter. The students in group C, on the other hand, spent the first two sessions planning the topic of their presentation and used the questions as tools to articulate possible subtopics. As the videotaped interactions show, these students agreed on the questions to ask and actually asked them during the planning sessions. However, each student self-assigned a few questions to him/herself and the questions were mainly formulated individually. The fragment analyzed in section 4.5.4 of this chapter represents the only instance of collaborative work on a linguistic artifact in group C. The collaborative formulation of the Facebook question reported in this fragment will prove to be similar to the collaborative production of script lines.

4.4.2 Formulating a transitioning line (group A)

The present analysis aims at showing how the written script for the presentation reaches its final form by being collaboratively modeled in one spate of talk by the coparticipants in group A (Figures 4.12.1 and 4.12.2). To this end, I will first present the artifact-as-final-product; i.e., the finalized written form that a script line takes in the students’ notebooks (Figure 4.9). I will then analyze the specific parts of the interaction where that script line emerged and was collaboratively modeled by the coparticipants during the third planning session.

Figure 4.9 reproduces the script-line-as-written-artifact in its final form: *addesso sapete dove si può mangiare, Maria va a parlare di cosa fate quando arrivate* ("now you

---

62 During the planning sessions, he participants in group D carried out extensive discussion about the topics for their presentation, and about the organization of the outline; they also contacted an Italian friend via Skype to ask him some relevant questions. In the last session, they rehearsed their individual presentations.
know where one can eat, Mary will talk about what you do when you arrive”). This script line – written in John’s notebook – is the transitioning line from John’s individual presentation on different types of Italian restaurants in Italy to Mary’s presentation on Italian dining etiquette. John will therefore be the animator (Goffman, 1981) of this line (i.e., the person performing the line) during the presentation.

![Image](90x515 to 525x582)

**Figure 4.9 Transitioning line: version 2 (group A)**

Figure 4.10 shows the two main versions that the script-line-as-emergent-artifact took from its first formulation, done by John in English, to its last version, collaboratively achieved through the contribution of each participant and finalized by John in Italian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version 1 (Session 3 Figure 4.12.1 – John):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>now you know where you go, we’ll tell you what to do when you get there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adesso sapete dove si può mangiare, Maria va a parlare di cosa fate quando arrivate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“now you know where one can eat, Maria is going to talk about what you do when you arrive”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.10 Transitioning line: versions 1 and 2**

The interaction where the script line emerged and through which it was collaboratively shaped by the coparticipants is reproduced below in Figures 4.12.1 and 4.12.2, focusing respectively on the first (now you know where you go) and on the second part of the line (we’ll tell you what to do when you get there). The analysis of these fragments will show how the authorship of the line is collectively achieved and distributed among the coparticipants.
Figure 4.12.1 reproduces the emergence of the first formulation of the entire line in English and the collaborative translation of the first part of the line in Italian. Figure 4.11 shows the spatial arrangement of group A during the third planning session. The transcript picks up right after the students’ creation of the transitioning line from Lucy’s presentation to John’s presentation (i.e., a line to which Mary refers as that when she says so::: (.) that transitions into john’s, lines 2 and 5).

MARY: [((looking at her notes))]

"let's see:.° (. ) so::: (. ) that transitions into]=

JOHN: [((snorting))]

MARY: [((looking at her notes))]

 [=john’s, and then jo:hn do you wanna:]

[transition: (. ) to the last one, or do you want me]

to::

[0.2]

[just kind of]

[0.2]

LUCY: "start talking?"=

JOHN: =>a’n’t you talking about etiquette?<=okay.

i’ll be like (. ) .hhh (. ) now you know, (0.2)

where you go:,

(0.4)
FIGURE 4.12.1 (cont.)

17 MARY: m[h.]
18 JOHN: [we]’ll tell you what to do when you get there.

19

20 MARY: [okay.=
((Mary and Lucy nod))
21 JOHN: =so i’l say that in italian.

22 (0.6)
23 so:. u:h .hhh (.) adesso, (0.6) #u::h# (0.9) sapere.
24                   now, to-know.

25 sapete?=
(you-PL)know?= you know?=

26 MARY: = sapete. (=you-PL)kn[ow.]
= you kn[ow.]

27 JOHN: [ade]sso sape- (0.2) adesso sapete,
[ no]w kno- now (you-PL)know,
[ no]w kno- now you know,

28 (0.9)
29 JOHN: >i’ll write< this down.

30 (0.3)

31 LUCY: ºm::h (0.2) dove mangiare?:°
         where to-eat?

32

33 JOHN: [((writing))
34 [adesso: (0.7) sapete:: (.) dove mangiare, (1.5)
[ no]w: (you-PL)know:: where to-eat,
[ no]w: you know:: where to eat,

35 [((John looks up))
36 [0.5) dove:
[ where:

37 [((writing))
38 [si puó mangiare,
[one can eat,

39 (0.9)

40 MARY: [((nodding))
41 [mh m:h,=

42 JOHN: [=((John looks up, then down))
43 =si puó:, no.
=one ca:n, no.
FIGURE 4.12.1 (cont.)

44 (1.2)

45 JOHN: "si può:" "one can:"

46 MARY: yeah.="you can:"

47 JOHN: [right.]="you can."

48 

49 JOHN: [(writing)]

50 [("si può:" "one can:" 

51 [(0.5) "tch-" (0.3) "mangiare," "eat," 

52 (0.2)

53 LUCY: or "one can."

54 [(looking at Mary)]

55 [(0.9)

56 [(Lucy keeps looking at Mary and nods)]

57 JOHN: [("("

58 LUCY: [as we learned.]

59 (0.4)

60 JOHN: [ah. ]

61 MARY: [there] you g[o:(h) hahu hahu]

62 LUCY: [(yeah. today.)]

63 JOHN: [(reading)]

64 [adesso: sapete]

65 [("dove:" "si può mangiare," 

66 (1.2)

In lines 4-12 Mary and Lucy offer two options to John: after his presentation, he could say a lead-in transitioning into Mary’s presentation or Mary could just start talking. In line 13, John re-asserts what Mary’s topic will be (i.e., dining etiquette) and, on that basis, he formulates in English the transitioning line he could perform: now you know

---

63 John does this with a reversed polarity question (Koshik, 2002), without even waiting for Mary’s answer (which comes neither verbally nor nonverbally).
where you go, we’ll tell you what to do when you get there (lines 14-18). Note how this HD line is introduced by the quotative frame *i’ll be like* (line 14), which indicates John as the future animator of the line, and projects a fair degree of likelihood over the script line modeled right after (specifically, note the assertive format, the absence of a modal verb, and the use of the indicative mood).

Once Mary and Lucy display acceptance of the line proposed by John (lines 20-21), John announces that he will translate that line into Italian (*so i’ll say that in italian*, line 22). The translation process (reproduced in Figures 4.12.1 and 4.12.2) will prove to be a complex endeavor, that entails all the students participating and contributing to the production of the final product. This process is in many ways similar to what architects and children do in designing: once an idea has been proposed, it can then be further shaped by the participants by using all available resources (in this case, the students’ knowledge of English and Italian).

In lines 24-25 John engages in a word-by-word translation of *now you know* (proposed in line 14). In so doing, he enacts two word searches\(^\text{64}\) (as indicated by the speech perturbations and the pauses in line 24), respectively targeting Italian *adesso* for *now*, and the verb form corresponding to *you know*. John produces first the ‘dictionary form’ (the infinitive *sapere*, “to know”, line 24) with downward intonation, then the conjugated form *sapete* (“you know”, line 25) with upward intonation, thereby asking for confirmation. In line 26 Mary confirms the form *sapete* and, subsequently, John repeats the translation so far (*adesso sapete*, line 27), possibly as a way to summarize the agreed-on version, before finalizing it in written form (see below).

\(^{64}\) For a detailed analysis of word searches as practices that are deployed in order to do planning, see: Markee & Kunitz, 2013.
In line 29 John announces that he will be writing down the portion of the line that has been translated so far. While he gets ready with his pen and notebook, Lucy proposes a candidate continuation of the line with *dove mangiare* (“where to eat”, line 31), with upward intonation. Note that this continuation is not a translation of John’s original proposal. In fact, he proposed *now you know where you go* (lines 14-15), whereas the line that is emerging with Lucy’s contribution is: *adesso sapete dove mangiare* (“now you know where to eat”). This version of the line is readily accepted by John who repeats the line-so-far, incorporating Lucy’s continuation as he is writing (lines 33-34).

However, in line 35, John stops writing and looks up for 0.5 seconds (line 36), before resuming the action of writing (line 37) and replacing Lucy’s contribution *dove mangiare* (“where to eat”, lines 31 and 34) with *dove si può mangiare* (“where one can eat”, lines 36-38). Mary accepts John’s repair (lines 40-41), but John himself displays uncertainty: he looks up again (line 42), straightforwardly rejects the impersonal form (*si può*, no., “one can, no”, line 43), then repeats it softly with slightly rising intonation (line 45), indicating that the matter is not settled for him yet.

In line 46 Mary confirms the accuracy of *si può* by providing its English equivalent; i.e., *you can* (with generic *you*). The English expression is thus taken as the basis against which the accuracy of the corresponding Italian expression is assessed (for a similar observation, see Chapter 5, section 5.7). John agrees with Mary’s proposed translation (*right*, line 47) and repeats it (*you can*, line 47), thereby explicitly stating what

---

65 The expression *dove mangiare* (“where to eat”) is accurate. However, John’s repair with *dove si può mangiare* (“where one can eat”) suggests that he treats the lack of a conjugated verb form as problematic. See also Figure 4.12.2, with *cosa fate* (“what you do”, line 93) replacing *cosa fare* (“what to do”, line 83). Even though, in the latter case, the repair may also be motivated by the participants’ orientation to a more agentive formulation in referencing the audience (I am indebted for this observation to Andrea Golato).
the object of his agreement is. He then resumes writing (line 49), and repeats the Italian form *si può mangiare* with low volume (lines 50-51).

So far, Lucy has not indicated her take on the accuracy of Italian *si può*. In line 53, though, Lucy proposes *one can* as another English equivalent for *si può*, thereby implicitly accepting the Italian expression. Lucy’s translation is formulated as an alternative (*or one can*) to Mary’s *you can* (line 46). Lucy, in fact, keeps looking at Mary (lines 54 and 56), thus designating her as the recipient of this alternative. But no response is forthcoming: Mary keeps her eye gaze on John’s notebook, while he is writing. At this point Lucy provides supporting evidence for the accuracy of the alternative just proposed: *one can* is a possible translation for *si può*, given what they have just learned in class (*as we learned ... today*, lines 58 and 62). This increment finally triggers her coparticipants’ reaction: they both acknowledge and affiliate with Lucy’s alternative, John with the change of state token *ah* (line 60; see Aijmer, 1987) and Mary with *there you go* followed by laughter tokens (line 61). Note how John’s and Mary’s different reactions suggest a different stance toward *one can*: to Mary, who treats it as a laughable matter, Lucy’s contribution does not add anything consequential to the business at hand (i.e., establishing the accuracy of *si può*). John’s *ah*, though, may indicate that Lucy’s turn acts as a reminder of what they had learned in class (i.e., that the Italian impersonal pronoun *si* corresponds to English indefinite *one*), which constitutes yet another piece of evidence that *si può* is correct. John then goes on to read the line-so-

---

66 John’s repetition of *you can* (line 47) could be a way to assert some epistemic rights over the matter. The repetition, however, may also be due to the fact that John’s *right* (line 47) is in partial overlap with Mary’s *you can* (line 46). The repetition would then display that John correctly understood (i.e., heard) the form that Mary had proposed.
far: *adesso sapete dove si può mangiare* ("now you know where one/you can eat", lines 64-65).

Figure 4.12.2 reproduces the lines that immediately follow the fragment in Figure 4.12.1. Here, the participants work on the second part of the transitioning line proposed before: *we'll tell you what to do when you get there* (line 18, Figure 4.12.1).

**FIGURE 4.12.2 – WHAT YOU DO WHEN YOU GET THERE (Group A, Session 3)**

```
67  JOHN: "h (1.2) [maria::: (0.8)
68         (((writing)))
69     [((looks up))
70     [((1.0) parla, (0.4)
71     [ talks,
72     va a parla?
73     goes to talks?
74     is going to talks?
75 (0.5)
76  JOHN: >is going to talk.<< yeah. sure.=
77  MARY: =mh mh.
78     [((John starts writing))
79  JOHN: va a: (0.4) parlare, (1.3) di:
80     goes to: talk, about:
81     is going to: talk, about:
82     [((lifts head and looks ahead))
83     [((1.1) mtch- u::h (0.4)
84     what you do "when you get there."
85 (0.4)
86  MARY: u::h ]
87  JOHN: [cosa]: f:are: (. ) quando: (0.7) u:h (0.9)
88     [wha:]:t to-d:o: whe:n
89  MARY: or=u::hm
90  JOHN: arriv- arrivano.
91     arrive- (they) arrive.
92 (1.0)
93  JOHN: yeah. sure. [fine.
94     [((resumes writing))
95 (0.2)
96  MARY: "mh mh."}
```
FIGURE 4.12.2 (cont.)

91  JOHN: [(writing)]
92                    [right¿ (.)] "va a parlare di:" (0.9)
93                    ["goes to talk about"
94                    ["is going to talk about"
95  [(cosa::: (0.3) fate: (1.6) qu::::::ando:::
96                    [wha::::::t (you-PL)do: whe::::::n:
97                    [wha::::::t you do: whe::::::n:
98  (0.4)
99  MARY: arriv-
100                 -
101  (0.7)
102  JOHN: [(writing)]
103                    [arrivano.
104                    [(they)arrive.
105  (0.5)
106  [when you guys arrive=]
107  MARY: =_::r u:hm (0.2) >wouldn’t it be< you ↑guys then,
108  >instead of< when they arri[ve?]
109  JOHN:       [ M]PH (0.2) you’re right.
110  MARY: u::hm, []
111  JOHN:   [ a]rrivate.
112                    [(you-u-PL)arrive.
113                    [ yo]u arrive.
114  (0.2)
115  MARY: si.
116  yes.
117  (0.4)
118  (Lucy nods))
119  JOHN: [(writing)]
120                    ["arrivate."
121                    ["(you-PL)arrive."
122                    ["you arrive."
123  (0.6)
124  [cosa fate: (.) quando:::
125  what (you-PL)do: whe::n
126  what you do: whe::n
127 [(writing)]
128                    [(1.4) "mtch-oo" (0.3) "quan"do::::::: (0.5)
129                    ["whe":::::::n
130 [(writing)]
131                    [(0.2) got it.
132                    [(you-PL)arrive,"
133                    ["you arrive,"
In lines 67-77 John works on the equivalent of *we’ll tell you* in Italian: he starts with *Maria parla* (“Maria talks”, lines 67-70), repairs with *va a parla* (“is going to talks”, line 71), and finally gets to *va a parlare di* (“is going to talk about”, line 77). First of all, note the difference between the English version with *we* (line 18, Figure 4.12.1) and the Italian versions with Maria as the subject of the line. In other words, as he formulates the line in Italian, John properly extracts the individual presenter (*Maria*) from the collectivity of the student-presenters (*we*): Maria is in fact the designated next presenter after John, on the topic “etiquette”.

Then, note how John’s repairs targeting the verb forms (from *parla*, line 70, to *va a parla*, line 71, to *va a parlare*, line 77) display his orientation to grammatical accuracy. So he repairs *parla* (“talks”) with *va a parla* (“is going to talks”), in the attempt to add the future element conveyed in English by *will* (here in its contracted form ’ll in *we’ll*, line 18, Figure 4.12.1) or by the periphrastic expression *to be going to*. This last expression proves to be the basis for John’s (incorrect)⁶⁷ use of Italian *va a* (literally, “goes to”), as indicated by line 73. Here, in fact, with *is going to talk*, John enacts the practice of translating back into English (see also Figure 4.12.1, lines 46-47 and Chapter 5, section 5.7) in order to assess the accuracy of Italian *va a parla* (“is going to talks”). Note that the retranslation is offered after a 0.5 second silence (line 72); i.e., in a position

---

⁶⁷ In Italian the future is expressed through inflectional morphology. The correct Italian form here would be *parlerà* (“(she) will talk”). John’s form *va a parla* might also be a transfer from Spanish, but I do not know whether John actually speaks Spanish or not.
where a response from his coparticipants would have been relevant, given the rising intonation on *va a parla* in line 71. In other words, the retranslation provides an additional element to determine the accuracy of the Italian form, so it could be used as a way to solicit a response from the coparticipants (see, for example, the fragment reproduced in Figure 5.29, Chapter 5, subsection 5.7.3). However, here John does not wait for his coparticipants’ reply and directly confirms the accuracy of the Italian form form with *yeah. sure.* (line 73). Overall, John’s behavior (with his eye gaze disengaged from the coparticipants and the lack of a pause in line 73) suggests that – by confirming his own line of reasoning (i.e., *va a parla* being accurate because of its equivalence with *is going to talk*) – he is asserting his epistemic authority over the matter at hand. Subsequently, as Mary shows her agreement (line 74), John resumes writing (line 76). However, while he is writing, he further repairs *va a parla* (“is going to talks”) with *va a parlare* (“is going to talk”, line 77), replacing the form *parla* (“talks”) with the infinitive *parlare* (“to talk”).

Ultimately, the current Italian formulation is: *Maria va a parlare di* (“Maria is going to talk about”; see line 77). This final change to the script line as emergent artifact is done while John is writing: it might well be that the material visibility of the form prompts John’s further modification of it (for a similar case of ‘noticing in writing’ see below, line 93, and also section 4.4.4).

At this point, though, John encounters some trouble: he lifts his head and looks ahead (line 78), while the following part of his turn is delayed by pauses and speech perturbations (line 79). John then produces the continuation of his turn in English: *what you do when you get there.* (line 80). Two interpretations for this action are possible:

---

68 The form *va a parlare* literally means “goes to talk” (without future reference) and is therefore incorrect in this context. However, John’s repair is syntactically accurate: if a verb follows the construction *va a*, it has to be in the infinitive form.
John had trouble remembering the second half of the line to be translated and/or formulating the continuation of the line in Italian.

In any case, if we compare the previous English version of the line with the current one, the only difference lies in the use of *what you do* (line 80) versus *what to do* (line 18, Figure 4.12.1). In Italian, though, John says *cosa fare* (“what to do”, line 83). He then engages in a word search (indicated by the pauses and the token *u:h* in line 83), targeting the verb form corresponding to *you get there*. Finally, in line 85, John produces the base form *arriv-* (“arriv-”), followed by the conjugated form *arrivano* (“they arrive”). By line 85, then, the translated line sounds like: *cosa fare quando arrivano* (“what to do when they arrive”) versus the English formulation *what you do when you get there*, proposed in line 80. This translation is positively self-assessed by John (*yeah. sure. fine*, line 87), who resumes writing (line 88). John’s behavior here is partly similar to his action in line 73: given the lack of a response from the coparticipants (in lines 72 and 86), he confirms (in lines 73 and 87) the accuracy of the form he himself has proposed (in lines 71 and 85). However, here John resumes writing (line 88) while still delivering his confirmation. Overall, with the actions in lines 73 and 87-88 John asserts his epistemic authority over the accuracy of the verb forms he proposes and his ownership of the line he is producing.

John’s translation, though, meets tentative assent (see the soft “*mh mh*” in line 90) from Mary, who actually tried to come in before (lines 82 and 84), possibly in an attempt to contribute to the translation process. On the other hand, John is pursuing stronger agreement (*right¿*, line 92), but without success, since no further response is immediately forthcoming (see the micropause in line 92). He nevertheless keeps writing as he repeats
part of the translation so far: *va a parlare di cosa *fate* quando* (“is going to talk about what you do when”, lines 92-93). In so doing, John replaces *cosa fare* (“what to do”, line 83) with *cosa *fate* (“what you do”, line 93), thereby treating the infinitive form as problematic (similarly to his repair of *dove mangiare*, “where to eat”, line 34, with *dove si può mangiare*, “where one can eat”, lines 36-38 in Figure 4.12.1). Note that, once again (see line 77 above), a modification of the line is performed while John is engaged in the action of writing. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine whether the form that is being repaired has already been written down at the moment of repair completion. However, as observed above, one can hypothesize that the modification might be triggered by the material visibility that the line has acquired or is about to acquire; at the same time, studies on collaborative writing (Storch, 2005; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009) have shown that students engaged in collaborative work produce more accurate texts (for a more thorough discussion of this issue, see Chapter 6, subsection 6.2.3).

In line 95, Mary continues John’s sentence-in-progress by producing the base form of the verb *arriv-* (“arriv-”); John then reconfirms the formerly produced *arrivano*. (“they arrive”, line 98) with downward intonation. Since no acknowledgment is forthcoming from his coparticipants (line 99), John retranslates *quando arrivano* (“when they arrive”) with *when you guys arrive* (line 100) with downward intonation, thereby offering the retranslated line as evidence for the accuracy of *arrivano* (for a similar retranslation practice, occurring after a silence, see also line 73). However, as Mary immediately points out (lines 101-102), *quando arrivano* translates into *when they arrive*, whereas John is trying to say *when you guys arrive*. John agrees with Mary’s correction
(you’re right, line 103) and produces the accurate verb form *arrivate* (line 105), which meets both Mary’s and Lucy’s acceptance (lines 107 and 109 respectively).

Note that Mary’s assent is expressed with Italian *sì* (“yes”; line 107). This language choice might add strength to Mary’s agreement with John: the agreement on an Italian form is formulated in Italian, in a context where the prevalent language of negotiation (or language of the process, see Chapter 5) is English.

Once his coparticipants have agreed, John quietly repeats the accurate verb form “*arrivate*” (“you arrive”, line 111) as he resumes writing (line 110). Finally, in lines 113-116, John repeats the part of the line that has just been translated, modified, and ratified: *cosa fate quando arrivate* (“what you do when you arrive”). Lastly, Mary confirms her acceptance of what has been done so far with the Italian token *sì* (“yes”, line 118; note the stress). The transitioning line has reached its final formulation: it is in Italian and it is written; the completion of this activity of collaborative translation is marked by the use of an Italian expression (for similar cases see below and Chapter 5, subsection 5.6.5.1).

Overall, in this subsection we have seen how a script line emerges in English and, like a design artifact, goes through various stages that are collaboratively shaped by the participants. Each stage builds on the previous one and is the basis for the next one: each stage thus embodies the planning trajectory so far and is both a product of and a resource for the planning process. Moreover, note how each new step can be taken only when intersubjective understanding of the plan-so-far is established and ratification is provided by the coparticipants. Thus, the act of ratifying – enacted with vocal (e.g., *mh mh*) and nonvocal (e.g., head nods) behaviors – is crucial in the process of collaborative shaping.69

At the same time, the practice of retranslation into English is frequently used to verify the

---

69 I thank Makoto Hayashi for this observation.
accuracy of Italian expressions (see: Figure 4.12.1 line 46; Figure 4.12.2, lines 73 and 100) and thereby to create the basis for the achievement of collective agreement.\footnote{For further examples of this practice, see Chapter 5, subsection 5.6.5.1.}

In the case analyzed here, the script line goes through two major transformations: its first version is in English, its final version is in Italian; also, the script line emerges in the oral interaction among participants, but it progressively acquires written form as its various stages are ratified by the coparticipants and parts of it are written in the students’ notebooks. Consequently, the ‘visibility’ of the script line increases and the plan it projects becomes available in the intersubjective space both in oral and written form. The script line then has a definite materiality, on which the coparticipants act to mold the line until it reaches its last stage, entirely finalized in written form.

In the fragments reproduced in Figures 4.12.1 and 4.12.2, various actions constitute the process of collaborative shaping: the participants add new elements to the line (i.e., Lucy’s addition in line 31, Figure 4.12.1); they modify it to better suit the presentation setting (i.e., the change of subject from \textit{we’ll tell you what to do} in line 18, Figure 4.12.1, to \textit{Maria va a parlare}, “Maria is going to talk” in lines 67 and 77, Figure 4.12.2); and finally, they translate it from English into Italian to comply with the syllabus and the teacher’s instructions (i.e., the language of the presentation has to be Italian).

In the process of collaborative molding, the participants rely on a variety of resources and tools. In the fragments analyzed above we have seen how the students use their own knowledge of the two languages and how they invoke what has been discussed in class as a valuable source of knowledge (lines 58 and 62, Figure 4.12.1). Overall, the participants show a clear orientation to grammatical accuracy and, to assess it, they frequently translate back into English. Thus, the L1 is a tool that the participants use as a
reference point and as a disambiguating resource (i.e., with *you guys* vs *they* in lines 101-102, Figure 4.12.2). The actions of translation (into the L2) and retranslation (into the L1) are thus two crucial practices enacted by these participants during the planning process.

### 4.4.3 Introducing the topics of individual presentations (group A)

In this subsection I will show how the script line-as-written-artifact reproduced in Figure 4.13 reaches its final form: *oggi le specialità sono* (“today the specials are”). This script line – written in Mary’s notebook – was created to introduce the topics of the participants’ individual presentations as if they were the specials of the day. Figure 4.14 shows the three main versions of this script-line-as-emergent-artifact: Lucy first proposed it in English in the first planning session (*today’s our special*); in the second session, Lucy reissued her proposal with a slightly different formulation (*our specials today are*); finally, the script line was translated by Mary into Italian (*oggi le specialità sono*). In this case, then, the analysis will track how a single script line gets modified over time, across different speech events.

![Image](image.png)

*Figure 4.13. The opening line: version 3 (group A)*
Figure 4.14 Part of the opening line: versions 1, 2, and 3

The fragment reproduced in Figure 4.16 shows the first emergence of the line.

Figure 4.15 illustrates the spatial arrangement of group A during the first planning session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOHN</th>
<th>MARY</th>
<th>LUCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FIGURE 4.16 – TODAY’S OUR SPECIAL (Group A, Session 1)

1  MARY: u:hm (0.4) s(h)o:. (0.3) >we’re waiters and<
2  waitresses, (0.5) u:hm
3  LUCY: “(something like)”°° (.). welcome to: bla bla bla:
4  restaura:nt,
5  MARY: right.=
6  JOHN: =yes.
7  LUCY: today’s our specia:l,
8  (1.0)
9  JOHN: yeah. we >could do that.< (.). we could just ((coughs))
10  start briefly ’bout (.). restaurants in general, (.).
The transcript picks up when Mary and Lucy summarize the decisions so far: they will pretend to be waiters and waitresses in a restaurant (lines 1-2) and the opening line of the presentation will be 'something like' (.) welcome to: bla bla bla: restaura:nt (lines 3-4). John agrees (line 6). Lucy then proposes a candidate continuation for the opening line: they might announce the specials of the day with today’s our specia:l (line 7). As the similar tone of voice suggests, this line is under the scope of the same quotative frame – something like\textsuperscript{71} – used for the first part of the line. This frame characterizes the following line as a tentative example of what the students might say during the presentation. Note also the lack of a specific subject in the quotative frame: the participants are in an early phase of their planning and they have not decided yet who the animator (Goffman, 1981) of this line might be. Moreover, the tentativeness conveyed by the quotative frame accompanies the temporariness conveyed by the expression bla bla bla in bla bla bla restaurant (i.e., their imaginary restaurant does not have a name yet).

Lucy’s proposal, in this sequential context and at this stage of the planning process (i.e., the beginning of the first session), seems to refer to the food menu they will illustrate. In other words, there is no indication yet about Lucy’s suggestion to use this script line to introduce the individual presentations. Nevertheless, John – after accepting Lucy’s proposed continuation (yeah. we >could do that.<, line 9) – starts listing the

\textsuperscript{71} This frame does not include a verb form: it is the only case in the present dataset.
topics they might pursue for their individual presentations: they could talk about restaurants in Italy and how they differ from restaurants in the US (lines 9-11). Mary and Lucy accept this topic (lines 13-14); then, in subsequent lines (not reported here), the participants expand on John’s proposal.

A few days later, during the second meeting, the participants go back to this opening line and engage in planning it in greater detail. The fragment reproduced in Figure 4.18 picks up right after the students translated the welcoming line in Italian and decided on *Pasta Hut* as the name of their restaurant. Figure 4.17 illustrates the spatial arrangement of group A during the second planning session.

![Figure 4.17 Group A, session 2: spatial arrangement](image)

**FIGURE 4.18 – OUR SPECIALS TODAY ARE (Group A, Session 2)**

1. **LUCY**: u:::hm (0.4) >do we want to say like< our specials today
2. **JOHN**: a:re. and then li:ke-
3. **LUCY**: (0.2)
4. **JOHN**: tir[amisu? ]
5. **LUCY**: [“*this i-o*”]
6. **LUCY**: (0.5)
7. **MARY**: [“nods looking at John”]
8. **MARY**: [mh mh.]
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9  (0.2)
10  LUCY: well= i: >’s thinking like we were getting to say like
11        our< topics.  
12  (0.8)
13  JOHN: o:h=o[k.]
14  LUCY:  [li]ke ou- >our specials< today are.
15        and then like [(0.7) °(you sa-)°°
16        [((looks and points at John))
17        you::[ say you)r- (.). like you [say your topic]c.=
18  MARY:  [mh mh. °mh mh.°]       [°°yeah.°°) ]
19  LUCY: =and then like i say my: topic and then like
20  you [say your topic.    ]
21  MARY:  [°°    °°)]
22  (0.5)
23  JOHN: s[ure.]
24  MARY:  [so:..]
25         oggi le [specialità,
26        today the [specials,
27        [((bends over notebook, moves pen to notebook))
28        [(0.7)
29        [((Mary writes))
30  LUCY: sì.
31        yes.
32  (0.8)
33  JOHN: u::hm: i think >(you/we) can make< a menu too.
34  (0.7)
35  JOHN: o:n (0.3) on the __. (.). really well.
36  (0.2)
37  JOHN: it’ll look nice.
38  MARY: [okay.
39  [((Lucy nods))
40  JOHN: so i’ll do that,
41  (0.4)
42  MARY: [((nodding))
43  [okay.
44  JOHN: and i’ll make it up fo:r=uh everybody. just pa:ss’em out.
45  (0.5)
46  MARY: [((looks down at her notes))
47  [great.
48  [((Lucy nods))
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47   (0.4)  
48   JOHN: sweet. °(and i’ll)° follow up!=
49   MARY: =that (.) sounds great! u:hm (.)

50    oggi le specialità:, (.) sono, right.
     today the specials:, are,

51   (0.6)

In lines 1-2, Lucy reissues her proposal about a possible continuation of the opening line: they may want to say our specials today are. Her proposal is introduced by the quotative frame: do we want to say like. Note how the reference form we and the modal verb want characterize the planning of this line as a collective decisional process, while a response is made relevant by the question format.

Here again, as in the fragment in Figure 4.16, there is no indication yet that Lucy is projecting a list of individual presentations rather than a list of food specials. This leads to a dual interpretation of her turn, as the following lines will show. First of all, Lucy projects a further continuation of her proposal (and then like-, line 2), but does not complete her turn, and two candidate continuations are provided (lines 4-5).

With tiramisu? (line 4) John offers an example of a special, namely the one they could be serving in class. The rising intonation on tiramisu suggests that John’s turn achieves a candidate collaborative completion of the turn initiated by Lucy and left incomplete in line 2. On the other hand, with ‘this i-o (line 5), Lucy expands on her original proposal, most likely suggesting how the items on the projected list should be introduced by the designated presenter (i.e., this is X).72

72 In light of Lucy’s proposal in lines 10-20, ‘this i-o can be interpreted as the beginning of another script line with which each participant would introduce the topic of his/her individual presentation (i.e., this is my topic).
After Mary’s affiliation with John’s mention of tiramisu (lines 7-8), Lucy specifies what would constitute the continuation projected in lines 2 and 5 (and then like ... this i-) by offering a descriptive formulation of her proposal: i: >’s thinking like we were getting to stay like our< topics (lines 10-11). Here Lucy suggests that, after the line our specials today are (lines 1-2), the student-presenters list the topics of their individual presentations. To this John responds in line 13 by claiming a new understanding of Lucy’s intended continuation (with the change of state token o:h; see Heritage, 1984b) and by accepting it (ok).

Lucy then redoes her proposal by recycling part of her turn in lines 1-2 (like ou->our specials< today are. and then like, lines 14-15) and completes it with a descriptive continuation that fully articulates Lucy’s version of the plan-so-far (lines 15-20): each of the student-presenters would introduce the topic of his/her individual presentation as one of the specials of the day. Ultimately, Lucy’s actions in lines 10-11 and 14-20 can be interpreted as rejecting John’s collaborative completion in line 4.73

Finally, both John and Mary display their acceptance of Lucy’s proposal: John with an emphasized sure (line 23); Mary with various acknowledgment tokens (the repeated mh mh. and yeah in line 18). The proposal gets further ratified by Mary’s turn in line 25: with oggi le specialità (“today the specials”) Mary offers a candidate translation of Lucy’s proposed script line (our specials today are, lines 1-2 and 14). Moreover, in saying specialità, Mary bends over her notebook and engages in the action of writing (lines 26-28): this part of the script line has reached its last stage and can be finalized in written form. The translation is then accepted by Lucy with Italian sì (“yes”, line 29). The use of Italian here might be seen as adding emphasis to Lucy’s confirmation: final

73 For this observation I am indebted to Makoto Hayashi.
agreement has been reached and *si* marks the sequential boundary between a course of action that has just been completed and the course of action that will come next (for a discussion of this and other similar cases, see Chapter 5, subsection 5.6.5.1).

In lines 31-42, John volunteers to create a nice menu with his computer and to make copies that can be distributed in class. Both Mary and Lucy accept his proposal (lines 36-37, 40-41, and 45-46). Finally, after positively assessing (line 49) John’s promise to follow up on this project (line 48), Mary completes the translation of the line: she repeats what they have gotten so far (*oggi le specialità*, “today the specials”, line 50) and then adds the verb *sono* (“are”). In the following lines (not reported here), the students discuss the order of their individual presentations and create Italian titles for them.

To sum up, in this subsection we have tracked the development of a script-line-as-emergent-artifact over time. Specifically, we have seen how an idea emerges in one session and is proposed in English to the coparticipants (*today’s our special*, Figure 4.16). In the next meeting, the same proposal is reissued in similar terms by the same participant (*our specials today are*, Figure 4.18). At this point, two different interpretations arise: the script line itself, proposed in a specific sequential context, does not unequivocally project the course of action intended by its author, who then needs to descriptively clarify what she means. Once this clarification work is done, the proposal meets the coparticipants’ approval, the line conveying the proposal is translated into Italian by another participant, and it finally gets written down.

This script line too then – like the one analyzed in Figures 4.12.1 and 4.12.2 (and like the design artifacts mentioned above) – goes through different stages and is
collaboratively shaped by the coparticipants. Specifically, it is translated from English to Italian and acquires written form in its final stage.

Moreover, the analysis of these two fragments has shown how an emergent artifact may be subject to multiple local interpretations, since the use of HD may not be sufficient to convey a particular proposal. The participants therefore need to resort to other available resources (e.g., descriptive formulations) to disambiguate the terms of their proposals. In general, these observations indicate how “interpretive flexibility” (Roth, 1996, pp. 145-146) influences the planning process: a resource in and of itself, this flexibility calls for negotiation and discussion among the coparticipants, so that agreement can be reached and the emergent artifact can be molded into its final form. Ultimately, as Roth (1996) states, artifacts in-the-making (whether they are discursive or not) “shape the interactions from which they emerge” (p. 150): they emerge from the local contingencies of talk-in-interaction, while shaping its further development. Put another way, as mentioned above (section 4.2), emergent artifacts are products of and resources for the planning process, which is conducted in and through talk-in-interaction; artifacts are produced by the participants’ planning activity, but they also influence its course.

4.4.4 Formulating the first part of an individual presentation (group B)

In this subsection I will show how the participants in group B collaboratively create and shape the first part of Jenny’s individual presentation (see Figure 4.16); both the participants work in collaboratively authoring the lines that Jenny will animate during the presentation (Goffman, 1981). The fragments reproduced in Figures 4.25.1 and 4.25.2, which occur at the beginning of the second planning session, are part of a longer
sequence where Emily and Jenny perform an activity they call “filling the sentences”. What they mean is that they need to fill in the very rough outline they began to produce in the previous planning session. Figures 4.19 and 4.20 below partially reproduce the final form of that temporary, intermediate artifact, which was materially created by Jenny, once she agreed with Emily on the topic and subtopics for their presentation.

![Figure 4.19 Emily’s part (group B)](image)

As Figure 4.19 shows, the first subtopic consisted of an illustration of the history of Carnival in Venice; this part was to be covered by Emily. During the time between session 1 and session 2, Jenny did not search for any information related to this subtopic and therefore nothing was added under the rubric “history”.

However, when it comes to Jenny’s own subtopic, the final state of the outline as artifact is rather different, as illustrated in Figure 4.20. Jenny was supposed to talk about various traditions related to the celebration of Carnival, such as foods, various events, and masks. Figure 4.20 shows how Jenny started to gather some material about her subtopic and how she consulted a few websites, listed in the artifact.
At this stage, then, “filling the sentences” means formulating full sentences in Italian in order to cover the material listed in the outline. The present section will therefore show how this process is done and how it leads to the collaborative production of Jenny’s first script line, illustrated in its final form in Figure 4.21 below. Specifically, I will describe how Jenny and Emily create the last line in the artifact: *feste e altre tradizioni importante per la celebrazione* (“parties and other important traditions for the celebration”). The participants start working on the first part of the line (Figure 4.25.1), then on the second part (Figure 4.25.2).

*English translation: “For Carnival in Venice there are… traditional foods, puppet show, parties and other important traditions for the celebration.”*.

---

74 English translation: “For Carnival in Venice there are… traditional foods, puppet show, parties and other important traditions for the celebration.”.
Figure 4.22 shows the three main versions of the first part of the line.

| Version 1 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.1 – Emily): |
| oltre (“other”) like other special traditions |
| ↓ |
| Version 2 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.1 – Jenny): |
| oltra tradizioni (“other-SG traditions”) |
| ↓ |
| Version 3 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.1 – Jenny): |
| altre tradizioni importante (“other-PL important-SG traditions”) |

In Emily’s talk the line initially emerged in Italian with *oltre* (for *altre*, “other”) and was then continued in English with *like other special traditions*. Jenny then translated part of the line into *oltra tradizioni* (“other-SG traditions”). Subsequent repair and vocabulary work led to the final written version of this part of the line in Jenny’s script: *altre tradizioni importante* (“other-PL important-SG traditions”).

Note that the letter change from *o* to *a* leads to a very significant change in meaning in Italian: the word *oltre* means “beyond”, while the word *altre* is the feminine plural form of the adjective *altro*, which means “other”. The students however do not orient to this: they take the two forms as equivalent in meaning. This may be due to the fact that, in Spanish – a language usually present in the linguistic repertoire of college level students in the US – the word for English *other* is *otro*. So *oltre* and *oltra* may represent interlingual forms for *altre* (feminine plural) and *altra* (feminine singular).
Figure 4.23 then illustrates the three versions of the second part of the line.

| Version 1 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.1 – Jenny): per la festa (“for the party”) |
| Version 2 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.2 – Jenny): per il carneval (“for the carnival”) |
| Version 3 (Session 2 Figure 4.25.2 – Emily): per la celebrazione (“for the celebration”) |

Here, no translation work is involved, since this part of the line emerges in Italian as *per la festa* (“for the party”), is replaced with *per il carneval* (“for the Carnival”), which is finally replaced with *per la celebrazione* (“for the celebration”). Interestingly, as will be shown below, the repair from *per il carneval* to *per la celebrazione* is motivated by an orientation to have some lexical variation in their script: the participants have just used the word *carnivale* at the beginning of the script (see the first line in the artifact reproduced in Figure 4.21); at the end of the line, the use of a different lexical item seems in order.

In talk not reported here, the participants negotiate the structure of Jenny’s presentation and, with it, the formulation of her first script line. They agree on listing the items (i.e., “all the things like food, parties, bla bla bla and masks”) that Jenny will later describe in more detail. In its final written form (see Figure 4.21), the list includes: traditional foods, puppet shows, parties and other important traditions.
The fragment reproduced in Figure 4.25.1 shows how the participants work on the last two items on the list (i.e., parties and traditions). Figure 4.24 illustrates the spatial arrangement for the participants in group B, during the second planning session.

EMILY

JENNY

Figure 4.24 Group B, session 2: spatial arrangement

FIGURE 4.25.1 – OTHER SPECIAL TRADITIONS (Group B, Session 2)

1. EMILY: should we say like

2. [(0.6)]
3. [((Emily brings her left hand to her notebook))]
4. [((eye gaze on notebook))]

5. EMILY: feste:::, (0.4) e::::
6. partie:::s, a:::nd

7. [(2.1)]
8. [((Jenny turns head from Emily to notebook))]
9. [((Jenny moves pen to notebook and starts writing))]

10. EMILY: [((looks up))]
11. [oltre::: (0.8) °u:::hm° (1.7)]
12. [atre:::r-F-PL]
13. [atre:::e\textsuperscript{75}]

14. ["like other special tradition[(s)]°]

15. JENNY: [LE]
16. [THE-F-PL] =
17. [THE] =

\textsuperscript{75} To visually show the difference between oltre and altre in the English translation in the transcript, I use ather for oltre and other for altre.
FIGURE 4.25.1 (cont.)

13 =ol- (0.2) oltra: tradizioni:,
   =at- other-F-SG traditions:-F,
   =at- other traditions:,

14 [(0.2)
15 [((Emily starts nodding))

16 JENNY: °or some[thing,º ]
17 EMILY: [°°mh mh°°] (. ) yeah.

18 [(0.3)
19 [((Jenny shifts eye gaze from Emily to notebook))

20 JENNY: o[kay.]
21 EMILY: [like]

22 (0.9)

23 JENNY: [yeah.
24 [(moves pen to notebook))

25 EMILY: yeah.
26 (0.7)
27 JENNY: °(a)ltre,°
   °(o)ther-F-PL,°
   °(o)ther,°

28 (0.2)
29 EMILY: °do you know (to) say special?°
30 (1.9)
31 EMILY: speʃaʃamente(h) hhh especially(h)

32 (0.3)
33 EMILY: .hhh
34 (0.4)

35 EMILY: hh [ha ha ha ]
36 JENNY: [(f)or what?] [(l)ifts head, turns to Emily])

38 (0.4)
39 EMILY: like (.) other s:pecial traditions like
40 (0.6)
41 EMILY: things that (.) °like traditions that only happen
42 there.°
43 (0.8)
44 EMILY: °maybe::° (0.8) importante tradizioni?
            important-F-SG traditions-F?
35 important traditions?

46 JENNY: per la festa?
for the party?
FIGURE 4.25.1 (cont.)

48  EMILY: sure.
49    [(4.8)
50    [((both participants erase what they wrote))
51  EMILY: [((writing))
52    ["u:h (0.4) feste::° (0.2)
53      [partie::s
54      [°u:h (0.4) feste::° (0.2)
55      [partie::s
56      [°u:h (0.4) feste::° (0.2)
57      [partie::s
58      [°u:h (0.4) feste::° (0.2)
59      [partie::s
60      [°u:h (0.4) feste::° (0.2)
61      [partie::s
62  JENNY: [e oltre?
63    [and ather-F-PL?
64    [and ather?
65    [((turns to Emily))
66  JENNY: altre?
67    [other-F-PL?
68    [other?
69    [((looks up))
70  EMILY: u:::hm (1.9) °°oltre.°°
71    °°ather-F-PL.°°
72    °°ather.°°
73    [[(glances at Jenny)]
74  EMILY: °how am i figuring this:.°
75  EMILY: >like there is:< [there’s altra:,
76    [other-F-SG,
77    [other:
78    [((turns to look at Jenny))
79  EMILY: °but that’s different.=right?°
80  JENNY: [°i don’t kno::w.°
81    [((moves right hand to keyboard))
FIGURE 4.25.1 (cont.)

82  (1.0)
83  JENNY: “I don’t remember.”

84  [(1.6)
85  [((Jenny shifts eye gaze from screen to notebook))]
86  [((and grabs pen))]
87  JENNY: “I kinda think it’s an [a.”
88  [(1.3)
89  [((Jenny adds a stroke on her script))]
90  JENNY: I’ll look it up.
91  (0.6)
92  JENNY: hhh ((laughter))
93
94  EMILY: you know [I think you’re right.<
95  [((grabs pen))]
96  (0.8)
97  JENNY: e altre:, and altre:F-PL, and altre:
98  (4.2)
99  EMILY: [tra dizon:
100  [tra dizon:-F.
101  [tra dizon:].
102  [((Jenny writes)]
103  JENNY: “mh mh.”
104  [(2.1)
105  [((both participants write))]
106  EMILY: importa- imp-
107  (0.7)
108  EMILY: tradizione [importante:?
109  tradition-F [importa:nt-F-SG?
110  tradition [importa:nt?
111  [((turns to Jenny)]
112  [(0.2)
113  [[[Jenny still writing)]
114  [(4.2)
115  EMILY: [importante” “tradizione.”
116  [’importat-F-SG” “tradition-F.”
117  [(important” “tradition.”
118  [((shifts eye gaze to notebook; starts writing)]
119  JENNY: “importante:, per:” (0.6) per (0.8) “for:
120  “importa:nt:F-SG,” fo:r” “for:
121  “importa:nt,” fo:r” “for:"
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The fragment picks up the talk when Emily produces the quotative frame *should we say like* (line 1). The formulation of the frame displays Emily’s orientation to the planning process as a collective endeavor, despite the fact that – in this specific stretch of talk – they are working on Jenny’s script for her individual presentation. Interestingly, the video shows how each participant is engaged in writing on her own notebook (see Figure 4.24). Unfortunately, though, I only have Jenny’s written artifact.

The quotative frame is followed by a 0.6 second pause (line 2), during which Emily brings her left hand (line 3) and her eye gaze (line 4) to her notebook. These actions display Emily’s orientation to writing the continuation of the line-so-far. She then keeps her gaze on the notebook as she reads the word *feste* (“parties”, line 5). However, the sound stretch on *feste:::*, the 0.4 second pause, and the elongation of the conjunction *e::::: (“and”) indicate that the formulation of the next item on the list is problematic and that a word search is underway (line 5).

A longer pause ensues (line 6), during which Jenny turns her head from Emily to her notebook (line 7), moves her pen to it, and starts writing (line 8). A close look at the video shows that Jenny is probably writing *feste e* (“parties and”). These words emerged for the first time on the interactional surface in line 5, where Emily appears to be reading them. Indeed, in a prior moment in the interaction (not reported here), the participants were each engaged in writing, and it is possible that Emily wrote something (i.e., *feste e*) that Jenny did not write.
The participants’ bodily postures and their eye gaze at this particular moment of the interaction show how they are each involved in different courses of action. Jenny is engaged in writing, while Emily is involved in a solitary search and is thereby not looking for Jenny’s help. Emily’s body is in fact partially torqued to her right, so that she is turning her left shoulder to Jenny; moreover, Emily is looking down at her notes. These embodied behaviors suggest that Jenny is not treated as a recipient here.

In line 9 Emily starts looking up as she delivers the word *oltre:* (line 10), an incorrect form for Italian *altre* (feminine plural form of *altro*, “other”). The perturbations and the pauses in line 10 show how Emily is having trouble in formulating the next due item. Emily then switches to English to formulate the continuation of the script line (line 11): she partially repeats the quotative frame (with *like*), followed by the line *other special tradition(s)*.

In overlap with the end of Emily’s turn, Jenny produces – with high volume and emphasis – the feminine plural form of the Italian definite article *LE* (line 12). She then starts producing *oltre*, but cuts it off (*ol*–, line 13) and repairs it with *oltra*: (line 13), followed by *tradizioni*: Jenny’s translation of Emily’s proposed script line (*other special traditions*, line 11) then is: *le oltra tradizioni* (“the other traditions”). Note how the three words in the noun phrase agree in gender, but not in number, since the interlingual form *oltra* (for Italian *altra*, “other”) is singular, while *le* and *tradizioni* are plural. The outcome of Jenny’s repair operation, *oltra*, is therefore grammatically inaccurate. Jenny does not address this issue in her following turn, but nevertheless hedges the epistemic strength of her version of the script line with “*or something*” (line 16), delivered with a soft voice. This increment on her previous turn suggests that an alternative might be
possible. In other words, the translation of the line she has proposed (le oltra tradizioni) is not definitive and this leaves space for other possible translations or formulations of the script line.

However, Emily does not orient to this possibility and indeed starts nodding (lines 14-15), before producing two acknowledgement tokens ("mh mh" and yeah) in line 17. Jenny then ratifies the agreement with okay (line 20), while she is looking at her notebook (line 19), thereby indicating – with her nonverbal conduct – that she is ready to write what they have just agreed on. The word okay, then, seems to mark a shift from one action (i.e., formulating a script line and coming to an agreement about it) to another (i.e., writing). Emily, however, in overlap with Jenny’s turn, delivers the word like (line 21), which seems to indicate a delayed response to Jenny’s hedge in line 16. This word, in fact, appears to be introducing a possible alternative to Jenny’s translation of the script line. But a 0.9 second pause follows (line 22), thus indicating that the projected alternative is not forthcoming. After this pause, as she starts writing (line 24), Jenny reconfirms her formulation in lines 12-13 with yeah (line 23). At this point, Emily agrees (yeah, line 25). While engaged in writing, then, Jenny produces the word "(a)ltre" (line 27), delivered with low volume. This version of the word carries two differences with respect to oltra in line 13: altre is in fact accurately plural; furthermore, the first vowel seems to be closer to an /a/ than to an /o/. However, neither of the participants orients to these changes.

Instead, Emily moves on to the part of the script line which has not been translated yet. Remember that, in line 11, she proposed the line: other special traditions. So far they have agreed on how to translate other traditions. They still need to work on

76 I thank Andrea Golato for drawing my attention to the use of okay in my data.
the word *special*. Emily thus issues a first pair part, “*do you know (to) say special?*” (line 29), which displays how she orients to Jenny as a possibly knowing participant. The question is directed to Jenny at low volume. Since no response is forthcoming (see the 1.9 second pause in line 30) – as Jenny is still engaged in writing and may therefore not have heard the question – Emily attempts at producing the relevant second pair part herself by saying *speʃ/ʃalmente*77 (“especially”, line 31). However, the following laughter tokens (lines 31 and 35) indicate that Emily is not orienting to *specialmente* as a valid answer. In line 37, finally, Jenny indicates her availability as a recipient, by lifting her head and turning to look at Emily, as she asks *(f)or what?* (line 36). Unfortunately, the audio is not clear enough to understand exactly what Jenny is saying and the transcription *(f)or what?* – which represents my best guess – only allows us to say that this turn is initiating repair, most likely on Emily’s question in line 29. It is apparent, though, that with her embodied behavior throughout lines 18-35 Jenny has not made herself available as a recipient; i.e., she has been engaged in writing, and her bodily posture shows that the focus of her action and attention is her notebook. With this in mind, and considering the low volume in the delivery of Emily’s question in line 29, Jenny’s repair in line 36 might be an indication of a problem in hearing. Emily’s response (line 39), however, shows that she treats Jenny’s repair as a different issue. So, instead of repeating her question in line 29 (*do you know (to) say special?*), as would be relevant in the case of a problem in hearing, Emily repeats the script line that she originally proposed in English in line 11. In fact, she says: *like (.) other s:pecial traditions like* (line 39). Note how, in delivering her turn, Emily emphasizes the word *special*; that is, the word she is having difficulty in

77 The word is not pronounced correctly: Emily says *speʃ/ʃalmente*, with the fricative /ʃ/ instead of the affricate /ʃ/. However, neither of the participants orients to this pronunciation issue.
translating into Italian (as indicated by her question in line 29 and by her turn in line 31). However, as mentioned above, Emily does not reissue her question.

There are two possible interpretations of the second *like* in Emily’s turn: a) it could be a second quotative *like*, used to mark the end of the quotation (I have found examples of this practice elsewhere in the present dataset); or b) it might be introducing a reformulation of the script line that Emily has just delivered. Whichever interpretation we endorse, the following 0.6 second pause in line 40 indicates that Jenny is not using this moment to display her understanding of Emily’s turn.

Emily then indeed proposes a reformulation of the script line with *things that (.)
°like traditions that only happen there°* (lines 41–42). This reformulation, combined with the emphasis on *special* (line 39), suggests that Emily is explaining what she means by using the word *special*: they should talk about other special traditions, that is traditions that only happen in Venice. Finally, Jenny orients to Emily’s turn as a request for help in translating the script line in Italian. However, instead of producing the exact translation of *special* (in Italian, *speciale*), in line 45 she tentatively (see the °*maybe:::*° and the pause) proposes *importante tradizioni?* (“important traditions”), with a slight change in meaning, from *special* to *important* (and a number agreement issue to which the participants do not orient: *importante* is singular while *tradizioni* is plural). The °*maybe:::*°, the 0.8 second pause, and the upward intonation in the delivery of her turn all indicate a rather weak epistemic stance on Jenny’s part as to her proposed formulation. Specifically, the upward intonation displays Jenny’s orientation to the relevance of Emily’s confirmation. However, no indication of a response is forthcoming; in fact, there is no sign in Emily’s nonverbal and verbal conduct (see the pause in line 46) that she is
about to produce a response. Instead, she keeps staring at Jenny, who finally proposes a further increment to the line-so-far with per la festa? (“for the party”, line 47). Upon the delivery of this increment, Emily accepts Jenny’s proposal with sure (line 48) and both the participants turn to their notebooks and erase what they had previously written (lines 49-50). It is probably at this moment that the grey area visible in Jenny’s artifact (Figure 4.21) is produced. To sum up, the script line that initially emerged as oltre like other special traditions is now in a temporary stage that looks like: (a)ltre importante tradizioni per la festa (“other important traditions for the party”).

Now engaged in writing (line 51), Emily repeats what they had agreed on at the beginning of the fragment: feste e oltre (“parties and other”, lines 52-53). In the meantime, Jenny starts writing too (lines 54-56). As she stops writing (line 57: Jenny lifts her pen from her notebook), Jenny looks intently at her notes (line 58), turns to Emily (line 60), and repeats e oltre? (“and other”, line 59) with upward intonation, thereby making relevant a response from Emily. With her action, Jenny is clearly initiating a repair on oltre. However, Jenny’s repair is followed by a 0.2 second pause (line 61). More specifically, Emily has finished writing, she is intently looking at her notebook, but she is not providing a response. In her subsequent turn, Jenny clarifies the scope of her repair initiation by asking: with an a or an o?: (line 62). Her repair is thus targeting the first vowel of the word (e.g., oltre versus altre).

What I would like to argue here is that Jenny’s repair initiation is prompted by her actions of writing and then looking at what she wrote: she sees oltre and suggests repairing it with altre. The issue presents itself as a matter related to and triggered by the writing process. That is, these lines might be what Mori and Hasegawa (2009) have
called a behavioral manifestation of cognition; more specifically, a behavioral manifestation of the psycholinguistic process of noticing (Schmidt, 2010). Such a process – which we might call “doing noticing” – emerges at this moment in the talk-interaction and becomes public in the intersubjective space through observable behaviors (see also section 4.4.2, Figure 4.12.2, lines 77 and 93, and other examples below). As other behavioral manifestations of cognition, noticing here is achieved as a social event that is intertwined with ongoing interactional activities (Mori & Hasegawa, 2009, p. 70).

To use Schegloff’s (2007, p. 87) terminology, it looks like Jenny’s repair initiation does an interactional noticing which is indeed engendered by a perceptual/cognitive noticing of the written form.

Despite Jenny’s clarification (line 62), though, Emily is still not producing a response. At first, she is silent (line 63), then she sighs (line 64) as she looks up (line 65). These observable behaviors seem to suggest that Emily has indeed understood Jenny’s question in line 62, but does not know what to reply. Jenny completes the repair by issuing a possible alternative to oltre; i.e., the form oltre? (“other”, line 66). The upward intonation makes relevant a response from her coparticipant, but a response is not straightforwardly produced. Instead, we have: a delay (the 0.2 second silence in line 67), the hesitation token u:::hm, and another, longer, pause (line 68). These are all signals that the forthcoming response is dispreferred (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). And it is dispreferred in the sense that it is marked by extreme uncertainty, conveyed by the perturbations mentioned above and by the very low volume with which Emily eventually confirms oltre (line 68) versus oltre (line 66). At this point, though, Jenny does not provide any uptake (see the 0.6 second pause in line 69) concerning the
emerging disagreement between her repair solution *altre* and Emily’s (weak) confirmation of *oltre*. Emily then produces a more explicit response to the form proposed by Jenny: *I think it's with an* (2.2) ↓*oltre:* (line 70). Note how the use of the verb *to think* together with the long 2.2 second pause in the middle of the turn right before the most crucial part of it projects a stance of uncertainty over Emily’s position. The delivery of ↓*oltre:* is indeed in a decisive downward intonation, but Emily’s facial expression and her shift in eye gaze from her notebook to Jenny as she pronounces the vowel (line 71) all suggest uncertainty.

Jenny does not respond to Emily’s action (line 72) and Emily quietly asks herself the question: "how am I figuring this:" (line 73). After a rather long silence (line 74), Emily produces the second pair part to her question (lines 75 and 78) by unpacking her line of reasoning: there is indeed the word *altra*, with /a/, but according to Emily that word is different (i.e., has a different meaning) from *oltre*. However, Emily is not certain about her line of reasoning, as manifested by the fact that she turns to look at Jenny (line 76) and asks for her confirmation with *right?* (line 78; note the upward intonation). Now, *altra* is the singular form of *altre* and both these forms correspond to English “other”; apparently, though, in Emily’s line of reasoning, *altra* means something else and therefore could be used to prove that she is right and that the accurate form for “other” is *oltre*, not *altre*. In any case, Jenny does not confirm Emily’s line of reasoning: a long silence follows (line 79), after which Jenny ends up declaring that she does not know (line 80) and that she does not remember (line 83). At the same time, her embodied behavior indicates that she is about to look up this word online: she in fact moves her

78 It is not only the grammatical packaging of the question that suggests that this is a self-directed question. There is also a shift in eye gaze: Emily shifts her eye gaze downwards.
right hand to the keyboard (line 81). She does not type anything though, but shifts her
eye gaze from the screen to her notebook (line 85) and grabs her pen (line 86), thereby
indicating that she is about to produce some modification on her written artifact. She
then counters Emily’s statement in line 70: if Emily thinks that the Italian equivalent of
*other* starts with /o/, Jenny thinks it starts with /a/ (line 87). And, as she produces *a* (line
87), she places her pen on her notebook (line 88). The stress on the vowel, the downward
intonation, and the fact that, a moment later (lines 89-90), she adds the stroke that turns
an <o> into an <a> (line 90) are all displays of certainty on Jenny’s part. So, despite
prefacing her opinion with a tentative *i kinda think* (line 87), Jenny’s embodied actions
convey confidence.

Emily, on the other hand, does not produce any uptake (line 89), neither in favor
nor against Jenny’s position. At this point, Jenny – despite the change she has produced
in her artifact (line 90) – announces that she will look up the relevant word (line 91) and
produces a laughter token (line 93), indicating that she treats the matter ‘o versus a’ (and
possibly their display of uncertainty and disagreement over it) as a laughable. However,
it is right at this moment that Emily finally declares her agreement with Jenny by saying
*you↑know>i think you’re right.<* (line 94) and grabs her pen (line 95). Thus, it is at
this moment that the matter is resolved and she can change her own material artifact.
Jenny then repeats the solution they have agreed on (*e altre;*, “and other”, line 97), but
with a slightly rising intonation.

This intonation pattern suggests that the script line is not complete yet, and this
interpretation is corroborated by what follows next. After a long silence (line 98), Emily

---

79 This action – which is clearly visible in the video – actually shows how, despite possibly saying *
*altre* in line 26, Jenny wrote *oltre* in her notebook.
delivers the next word in the script line, *tra di zio ne:* (“tradition”, line 99), in a staccato fashion. Jenny displays her alignment with Emily by starting to write (line 100) and producing – albeit very quietly – the tokens °mh °mh° (line 101). During the following silence (line 102), both participants write (line 103). And it is once again Emily who attempts the delivery of the next word in the script line. She starts producing the word *importante,* but cuts it off twice (line 104). It is not clear, at this point, what the cause of the trouble might be. After a 0.7 second pause (line 105), which shows how Jenny is not orienting to Emily’s initiation of repair, Emily produces *tradizione importante:*? (line 106). As she delivers *importante,* Emily turns to Jenny (line 107); this action, combined with the upward intonation characterizing the delivery of the turn, makes Jenny’s response relevant. Jenny, however, is still writing (line 109) and a 0.2 second pause ensues (line 108). At this point, Emily very quietly repeats the next two words in the script line, albeit with an inverted word order: instead of saying *tradizione importante* (as she did in line 106), she now says °*importante* °°*tradizione* °° (line 110). It is impossible to determine whether the initiation of repair in line 104 was targeting the word order. At this point, regardless of the nature of the trouble source, the matter is now settled for Emily, since – during the delivery of her turn – she shifts her eye gaze from Jenny to her notebook and starts writing (line 111). Finally, in line 112, Jenny takes the floor and, after repeating *importante* with a quiet voice, she formulates the continuation of the script line: °per °(0.5) per °(0.8) uhm °(0.6) per: (.) il carneval? (lines 112-113). The continuation, produced with upward intonation, makes relevant Emily’s response,

---

80 One could object that, given the places of Emily’s cut offs, it is not possible to say whether she is cutting off Italian *importante* or English *important.* However, given the fact that the participants are now working on the translation of the script line into Italian, it makes sense to think that Emily is struggling with the Italian word, and not with English.
which indeed comes with a soft “okay” in line 115. Here, the word okay seems to be used to ratify the participants’ agreement over a larger portion of a script line.

From what emerged and got negotiated and ratified in the talk, the script line-as-emergent-artifact is as follows: *feste e altre tradizione importante per il carneval* (“parties and other-PL. important-SG. tradition for carnival”). The noun phrase *altre tradizione importante* carries a number issue: *altre* (“other”) is plural, while *tradizione importante* (“important tradition”) is singular. Note also that the word *carneval* is elided: the last vowel of the standard Italian form *carnevale* is missing. In the students’ talk, *carneval* is probably an interlingual form, involving a cross with English *carnival*; another example of an interlingual form is *carnivale*, which appears at the beginning of Jenny’s script (see Figure 4.21). Neither the number issue nor the pronunciation issue have been oriented to by the participants in the talk so far. Figure 4.21, however, shows that Jenny ended up writing *altre tradizioni importante* (“other-PL. important-SG. traditions”), thereby accurately marking number agreement on *altre* and *tradizioni*, but not on *importante*. This language work is evidently the result of an individual effort that does not emerge on the interactional surface. On the other hand, in the following stretch of talk (reported in Figure 4.25.2 below), the participants do repair the form *carneval* with *carnevale*.

In lines 117-119, while keeping her right hand on the keyboard and her eye gaze on the screen, Jenny proposes two repairs on the expression *il carneval* (“the-M carnival-M”). First of all, she initiates repair on *il* (the masculine form of the article), by suggesting that the accurate form might be feminine *la* as in *la carneval:* ("the-F
carnival-M”, line 118; note the emphasis on la). She then repairs the elided form carneva::l with carnevale: (line 119; note here the elongation on the final vowel).

FIGURE 4.25.2 – FOR THE CELEBRATION (Group B, Session 2)

117 JENNY: (((right hand on keyboard, eye gaze on screen)))
118 [would it be::: (1.0) la: carneva::l, =>like<
[ the:-F-SG carnival::l-M, [the: carnival::l,]
119 [carnevale:, [carnival:-M, [carnival:,
120
121 EMILY: 1.0)
122 (1.0)
123 JENNY: (((looking at Emily))
124 [il.= [the-M-SG.= [the.=
125 EMILY: =car[neval(e). ]
=car[nival-M. ]
=car[nival. ]
126 JENNY: [il carnevale, ]
[the-M-SG carnival-M,] [the carnival, ]
127
128 ((Emily nods looking at her notebook))
129 EMILY: °yeah.°=
130 JENNY: °okay.°
131 (5.8)
132 (((both participants write))
133 JENNY: [okay. 134 (((lifts pen from notebook))
135 (24.6)
136 (((Emily keeps writing; Jenny searches online))
137 EMILY: [maybe sa:y: per:::
[ for:::
138 (((looking at her notebook))
139 (1.0)
140 (((Jenny shifts eye gaze from screen to Emily))
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141 EMILY: /s/elebrazione?
   the-F-SG celebration-F?
   the celebration?

142

143 EMILY: `cause we started the

144 [sentence like with
145 [([points at a specific area on notebook])
146 [([Jenny turns to her own notebook])

147 [(0.7]
148 [([Emily lifts pen from her notebook])
149 [([Jenny starts pointing gesture on her notebook])

150 EMILY: ["the carnival."]
151 [([Jenny points at a specific area on her notebook])

152 [(0.2]
153 [([Jenny starts placing left hand on notebook])

154 EMILY: [([moves pen to notebook])
155 ["you know?"

156 [(1.3]
157 [([Jenny starts erasing])

158 JENNY: that’s a good one.
159 [(0.6]
160 EMILY: "bra (0.5) <zio:ne>"°
161 (1.8)
162 EMILY: oKAY.

163 [(1.3]
164 [([Jenny starts writing])
165 [([then turns head to Emily])

166 [([Jenny leans toward Emily’s notebook])
167 JENNY: [\1l-
   [the-M-SG-
   [the-
   (0.5)

169 JENNY: /s/elebrazione?
   the-F-SG celebration-F?
   the: celebration?
170 [([starts placing left hand on notebook])
171 [([shifts eye gaze to her notebook])

172 [(0.6]
173 [([starts erasing])

174 EMILY: s::i::.
   ye::s::.
FIGURE 4.25.2 (cont.)

175 (0.2)
176 JENNY: okay.

177 [(3.0)
178 (((Jenny writes))

The form *carnevale* might have its source in whichever webpage Jenny is looking at on the computer screen; that is, any Italian website would use the word *carnevale* (and not *carneval*). On the contrary, though, the source of the repair on *il* cannot be the website, since *carnevale* is a masculine noun and thereby requires the masculine form of the definite article: it requires *il*, not *la*. The suggested repair is thus the result of Jenny’s uncertainty over the gender of the word *carnevale*. Nouns ending in *–e*, in fact, can be masculine or feminine, and are typically the cause of some difficulties for L2 speakers of Italian (Chini & Ferraris, 2003; Gudmundson, 2010, 2012). And here uncertainty is definitely conveyed by the packaging of Jenny’s turn in line 118 (*would it be::: (1.0) la: carneval::l*). More specifically, uncertainty is manifested through the question format, the use of the conditional mood in the modal verb (*would*), the elongation on *be*, and the one second pause right before the delivery of *la*.

In contrast with Jenny’s display of uncertainty, after a one second pause (line 120), Emily strongly reaffirms the accuracy of *il:* (line 121). Note how the stress and the downward intonation converge in conveying an epistemic stance of great certainty. Jenny repeats this form (*il*, line 124), Emily then latches the relevant noun (*carnevale*, line 125) onto the article, while Jenny repeats the whole noun phrase (*il carnevale*, line 126). However, the slightly rising intonation and especially Jenny’s eye gaze constantly

---

81 The form *carneval* could be used in the Venetian dialect, where elisions are very frequent. However, the list of online resources that the participants have provided at the end of the planning sessions shows that Jenny and Emily consulted websites written in standard Italian, not in Venetian. This is also apparent when they read aloud the content of a webpage.
directed at Emily indicate that Jenny is not completely certain yet and is waiting for a further confirmation from her coparticipant. Indeed Emily confirms the accuracy of the gender agreement in the expression *il carnevale* with head nods (lines 127-128) and with the token "yeah" (line 129). Finally, Jenny’s "okay" in line 130 closes the repair sequence. Both participants then engage in writing (lines 131-132). The *okay* in line 130, then, is another example (see Figure 4.25.1, lines 20 and 115) of how this token is used to finalize agreement between the coparticipants, and to mark the boundary between planning talk and the action of writing. After 5.8 seconds, Jenny stops writing (line 134) and utters another *okay* (line 133), signaling her shift from writing to the next course of action (i.e., searching online). With her actions, then, Jenny indicates that this first part of the planning process is over. The script line, in fact, has reached its final form: it is in Italian, it is accurate, and it is written.

In the next 24.6 seconds (lines 135-136), then, Jenny orients to a new course of action and searches something online, possibly looking for information to include in the following part of her script; Emily, however, is still engaged in writing something. Once she is done writing, Emily looks at her notebook (line 138) and, with *maybe say: per:* (line 137), projects forthcoming repair on the phrase introduced by *per* in the script (i.e., *per il carnevale*). After a one second pause (line 139) during which Jenny shifts her eye gaze to Emily (line 140), Emily indeed repairs *il carnevale* with *la /s/elebrazione*? ("the celebration", line 141; note the upward intonation). Since a response from Jenny is not immediately forthcoming (line 142), Emily produces an account (lines 143-150) for

---

82 The pronunciation of the first syllable of the noun is inaccurate: it should be /tʃe/, written as <ce>. The participants do not orient to this as an issue (see Jenny’s inaccurate pronunciation in line 169 as well) and the word is written correctly in the script. Once again, the pronunciation /s/elebrazione might be an interlingual form, due to a transfer of English rules (where the <ce> in celebration is pronounced as /se/).
her suggested repair: they started the script line with “the carnival” (line 150). This implies that a second use of the same term is not adequate; hence the suggested replacement of carnevale with the hypernym la celebrazione. Emily’s suggested repair, prompted by her noticing some trouble in the written script, shows an orientation to stylistic matters as well. In other words, it seems that, for this participant, it is not sufficient to have grammatically accurate forms (see the repair on la versus il carnevale, at the beginning of Figure 4.25.2, line 121) and appropriate vocabulary (see the work on the translation of special started in Figure 4.25.1, line 28): it is also important that the vocabulary is adequately varied.

Note how Emily’s proposal is exquisitely coordinated with gestures. In lines 143-144 Emily in fact says: ‘cause we started the sentence like with. This turn-at-talk is incomplete, but the relevant information is provided by Emily’s pointing gesture (line 145). With it, in fact, she indicates a specific area on her notebook; i.e., very likely the area where the initial part of the script line is written: per Carnivale a Venezia ci sono (“for Carnival in Venice there are”).

Jenny, however, does not orient to this gesture at all, since – as soon as Emily starts delivering the word sentence (in we started the sentence, lines 143-144) – she turns to her own notebook (line 146) and intently looks at it to find the trouble source targeted by Emily’s repair. At this point, Emily lifts the pen from her notebook (line 148) and, since Jenny has not verbally indicated that she has found the trouble source yet, Emily quietly delivers it in line 150: “the carnival”.

Despite being silent, Jenny’s nonverbal conduct displays that most likely – in her own script and before Emily’s turn in line 150 – she has found the trouble source targeted
by Emily. In fact, in line 149 Jenny starts a pointing gesture with her pen, which then lands on a specific portion of Jenny’s script and is kept there while Emily says “the carnival”. Note also that, in the following 0.2 second silence (line 152), Jenny starts placing her left hand on her notebook (line 153), with a gesture indicating that she has identified the trouble source and is now ready to erase it.

At the same time, it looks like Emily is still trying to solicit a verbal response from Jenny (see the “you know?” in line 155). The apparent misalignment in the talk is due to the participants’ bodily postures and to the participation frameworks they generate: each participant’s eye gaze is focused on her own notebook. Thus, Emily cannot see Jenny’s nonverbal displays of affiliation with the course of action she initiated and keeps trying to elicit Jenny’s verbal uptake on the repair she suggested. Nevertheless, Emily’s nonverbal conduct indicates that she is confident about the validity of the replacement she proposed. She in fact moves her pen to her notebook (line 154), thereby clearly displaying her readiness to write and modify the script-so-far.

In the following 1.3 second silence (line 156), Jenny starts erasing (line 157) and finally produces a positive assessment of Emily’s *la celebrazione* (*that’s a good one*, line 158). Emily, now engaged in writing, very quietly utters part of the expression she suggested (*bra (0.5) <zio:ne>* (line 160) and with *oKAY* (line 162) suggests that the repair sequence is finished and that the written artifact has been modified accordingly.

Jenny, on the other hand, starts modifying her script when Emily is already done. During a 1.3 second gap (line 163), Jenny starts writing (line 164), then turns her head to Emily (line 165), and delivers *il*- (“the-M”, line 167). As she utters this form of the definite article, Jenny leans toward Emily’s notebook (line 166), ostensibly to see what
Emily actually wrote. This action once again shows how Italian nouns ending in –e are problematic for L2 users in general, and for Jenny in particular. Specifically, while Jenny – at the beginning of the fragment (line 118) – tried to repair *il carnevale* with *la carnevale* (line 114), here she suggests the form *il celebrazione* versus *la celebrazione*. In both cases, the form proposed by Jenny is inaccurate, is introduced somewhat tentatively, and with an orientation to Emily as a speaker who is more knowledgeable on these grammar issues and whose confirmation is thereby crucial.

In my interpretation, the action performed by Jenny in line 166 is not an instance of repair initiation on Emily’s *la celebrazione* (line 141). In light of the following turns, where it clearly appears that Jenny wrote *il celebrazione* and subsequently erases it, I am more inclined to think that Jenny initiates repair on what she herself has written. In other words, she sees *il* on her own script, then – in the face of doubt – she turns to Emily to see what this participant has written. If this interpretation is correct, we have another behavioral manifestation of participants doing noticing, similar to what we saw in Figure 4.25.1 (line 59).

But let’s turn to an analysis of Jenny’s nonverbal conduct. As mentioned above, Jenny utters *il* while simultaneously leaning toward Emily’s notebook (lines 166-167), with her eye gaze fixed on it. Jenny keeps this posture for the following 0.5 seconds (line 168) as she reads aloud what Emily had written: *la: /s/elebrazione?* (line 169). This turn is delivered with upward intonation, but Jenny’s nonverbal conduct does not display any kind of uncertainty: in the midst of the delivery of the word *celebrazione*, Jenny starts placing her left hand on her notebook (i.e., an indication that she is about to erase
something; line 170),\(^{83}\) shifts her eye gaze from Emily’s notebook to her own notebook (line 171), and starts erasing the relevant part of her written script (lines 172-173). These actions show how Jenny treats Emily as a more knowledgeable participant in matters of Italian grammar. Emily, in response, does provide a strong confirmation with an elongated and stressed \(\text{s::i::} \) (“yes”, line 174); moreover, the use of Italian seems a semiotic resource used by this participant to further strengthen her response and to sequentially mark the end of the current action (see above and Chapter 5, section 5.6.5.1 for other examples of this practice). Jenny then expresses agreement with \emph{okay} (line 176) and writes (lines 177-178): yet another example of \emph{okay} being used to finalize agreement and mark the shift between a completed course of action and the beginning of a new action. In conclusion, the analysis of the fragment in Figure 4.25.2 has shown how the grey area in Jenny’s script (Figures 4.4 and 4.21) is the outcome of two subsequent erasures: Jenny deleted \emph{il carneval} and replaced it with \emph{il celebrazione}, then erased \emph{il} in order to have \emph{la celebrazione} as the final version that appears in the script-line-as-final-product.

To sum up, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 4.25.1 and 4.25.2 has demonstrated how the participants in group B collaboratively work on a written artifact and, more specifically, on the beginning of Jenny’s individual presentation. Their actions are similar to those performed by the students in group A: planning is oriented to as a collaborative process during which script-lines-as-emergent-artifacts go through various stages, until they reach their final written form in Italian. In this process, translation into

---

\(^{83}\) The video shows how this gesture is identical to the gesture in line 153. When she erases, Jenny keeps her left hand on the notebook in a V shape: the thumb and index on one side, the other three fingers on the other side. The eraser, held in her right hand, erases the portion of the script inside the V.
Italian, repairs and modifications of the current version of the discursive, linguistic artifact are frequent and require the subsequent ratification of all the participants. Ratification, in turn, is performed verbally (with English okay and Italian sì) and nonverbally (with the actions of erasing and writing).

What is interesting here is that Jenny and Emily work on two different written artifacts and this has an impact on their participation frameworks. More specifically, their own artifact is the focus of their individual attention and embodied actions, despite the fact that they clearly orient to having the same version of the script line. What can happen, as we have seen in the analysis of Figure 4.25.2, is that an apparent misalignment between the coparticipants might ensue in the talk.

Furthermore, it appears that, in these fragments, certain changes on the artifact-so-far are prompted by the material nature of the artifact itself. That is, seeing a word as it is written in the script might prompt the participants to notice some trouble with the word, be it a grammar problem or a matter of lexical variation. This action of doing noticing may in turn lead to a subsequent repair operation. In the fragment reproduced in Figure 4.25.1 this happened with oltre being repaired to altre (lines 59-66), while in Figure 4.25.2 it occurred with il carnevale being substituted by the hypernym la celebrazione (lines 137-141) and with il celebrazione being replaced by la celebrazione (lines 166-169). These actions show how the participants orient to the accuracy of their written script, both in terms of spelling (as with altre versus oltre) and in terms of grammar (as with il versus la celebrazione), while also orienting to lexical variation (la celebrazione versus the repetition of il carnevale).
Finally, these fragments have also shown the variety of resources used by the participants to convey their epistemic positioning. The participants’ epistemic stances are in fact manifested both in their verbal and in their nonverbal conduct. For example: expressions like *or something* (Figure 4.25.1, line 16), verbs of knowing (Figure 4.25.1, lines 29 and 80), remembering (Figure 4.25.1, line 83), and thinking (Figure 4.25.1, lines 70, 87, and 94), questions formulated with modal verbs (such as *would it be* in Figure 4.25.2, line 118), adverbs such as *maybe* (in *maybe say* in Figure 4.25.2, line 137), together with prosody, and with the timing of nonverbal actions such as shifts in eye gaze (e.g., Jenny in Figure 4.25.2, line 165), pointing (e.g., Jenny in Figure 4.25.2, line 149), writing (e.g., Emily in Figure 4.25.2, line 154), erasing (e.g., Jenny in Figure 4.25.2, lines 170 and 173) are all behavioral indications of the participants’ epistemic stances. Through these diverse semiotic resources, the participants manifest to each other their own epistemic positioning, while at the same time displaying their own orientation toward the coparticipant’s epistemic status (see Mori & Hasegawa, 2009 for the relevance of the participants’ assessment of each other’s knowledge in the development of the interaction).

4.4.5 Formulating a question to post on Facebook (group C)

As mentioned in section 4.3, the participants in group C did not do any collaborative work on their written scripts. However, in the first planning session, a linguistic artifact – consisting of a question that Annie wanted to ask the Italian students on Facebook – is indeed the outcome of some collaboration among the participants.

The stretch of talk where this collaboration happens is reported in Figure 28 and it occurs towards the beginning of the first planning session, when the participants are still
negotiating a possible topic for their presentation. Before settling on Italian students’ free
time and on study abroad programs (see Chapter 3, Table 3.2), the participants discussed
a variety of topics, including transportation and campus jobs. It is to this last topic that
Annie’s question relates.

In the following analysis I will show how the question formulated by Annie goes
through successive transformations and expansions, until it reaches its final written form.
During this planning process, Craig and Donny intervene and, in different ways,
collaborate in the production of the question-as-emergent-artifact. Unfortunately, I do
not have access to the Facebook wall where Annie posted the final artifact, but the final
version emerges in the talk, once Annie is done writing and reads what she has written
(Figure 28, lines 117-122).

Figure 4.26 illustrates the two main versions of the question. Annie starts with
Italian *alcuni di voi* (“any of you”), then produces a more complete formulation of the
question in English: *does anybody have a job on campus*. After a process of
collaborative shaping, the question-as-final-product – now entirely written in Italian – is
formulated as follows: *Ciao tutti. Alcuni di voi avete lavoro a scuola? Quanto lavori ogni
settimana e dove lavorate?* (“Hello everyone. Do any of you have job at school? How
much do you (SG) work every week and where do you (PL) work?”).
The question has a syntactic problem (i.e., a problem in subject-verb agreement) and an inconsistency. First of all, the subject *alcuni di voi* (“any of you”) requires the use of a verb form conjugated in the third person plural, since the indefinite *alcuni* – which is the grammatical subject of the sentence – is plural. However, the participants settle on a verb form conjugated in the second person plural (*avete*, “you-PL have), as if the subject were *voi* (“you-PL”). Second, when asking about how much the Italians work and where, the participants use – for the first part of the question – a verb form conjugated in the second person singular (*lavori*, “you-SG work”) and – for the second part – a verb form conjugated in the second person plural (*lavorate*, “you-PL work”). There is then an inconsistency in the subjects used in the same question, which is reflected in the conjugation of the verb forms. However, the participants do not orient to this, therefore this matter will not be further explored in the analysis.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 4.28 illustrates how the participants get to the final version of the question. Figure 4.27 shows the spatial arrangement of group C in the first planning session. The transcript picks up the interaction when, after some discussion on possible topics to cover in their presentation, Donny summarizes what they have proposed so far: transportation, campus jobs, and study abroad programs (lines 1-3, 7,
and 11-12). Donny starts by mentioning the first two ideas: transportation and campus jobs. In the meantime, Craig seems to be jotting down the topics mentioned by Donny (line 5). He thereby repeats campus jobs: with listing intonation (line 6); then, in partial overlap with Craig’s turn, Donny repeats the other topic, accompanied by a gloss: transportation, =how they get around (line 7). The third topic, study abroad, is mentioned in lines 11-12.
their money. = like you know like (. ) . hh like do they spend it o:n (0.6) school supplies, = or= ( .) you know like on Books. or do the-

(((Craig and Annie look around))

ANNIE: uh-hu.

KITTY: = "what are you looking at?"

CRAIG: = "I’m seeing if there’s an [outlet]"=

KITTY: [oh oh ]

CRAIG: = "(and a ) i can put my laptop."

KITTY: = u::hm (0.8) you know like (1.2) do they spend their money like <recreationally::, =like (.) or do they like> [have to buy] their books=

ANNIE: [u:hm: ]

KITTY: =like do most kids.=

ANNIE: = "yeah. =) >i think it would be interesting to see.< (. ) so >i’m gonna write on the wall.<

[((hands on keyboard))

[ so **alcuni han**- uh
 [ any people (they) hav-
 [ (do) any people hav-

[0.8)

[ ((turns to coparticipants))

**alcuni di**

**any-PL of**

**any of**

[ ((turns head to screen and starts typing))

[ "voi: right?"

[ you:=PL

[ you:

[ (1.8)

[ ((Annie keeps typing))

CRAIG: = "i don’t understand."="

ANNIE: = **alcu**-° u:hm = does anyone have a<- a job on campus.=

CRAIG: 0:h oh. okay.

ANNIE: >**alcuni di**< vo:i,

>any-PL of< yo:u-PL,

>any of< yo:u,
FIGURE 4.28 (cont.)

52 [(2.2)
53 [((Annie lifts left hand from keyboard))
54 [((moves her head back and looks ahead))
55 [((displays uncertainty in her facial expression))
56 [((Craig glances at Annie))

57 CRAIG: °avete un lavoro?°
   °(do-you-PL)have a job?°
   °do you have a job?°

58 (0.4)
59 ANNIE: [((writes)]
60 [a:veteko::
   [do-you-PL]ha:ve:::
   [do you ha:ve:::

61 [6.1]
62 [((Annie writes; Craig looks at her screen)]

63 KITTY: [((looking at the desk or window behind)]
64 [°°(            )°°

65 (0.3)

66 ANNIE: che fate.
   what (do-you-PL)do.
   what do you do.

67 [1.7)
68 [((Annie writes)]

69 ANNIE: e::
   a:::nd

70 [1.9)
71 [((Annie stops writing)]
72 [((Craig keeps looking at Annie’s screen)]

73 CRAIG: >it would be like< (. s:i:
   ye:S:

74 (0.4)

75 CRAIG: °che fate.°
   °what (do-you-PL)do.°
   °what do you do.°

76 DONNY: i me[an every]time
77 ANNIE: [°o:h.° ]

78 DONNY: michael or annie it goes,

79 [1.1)
80 [((mutual eye gaze established between Donny and Annie))]
FIGURE 4.28 (cont.)

81 DONNY: [dear whoever. ] °° (deep voice))
82 [°(deeper voice)])

83 ANNIE: well caro [deep voice]
dear [M-SG]
dear [deep voice]

84 [((glances at Donny)]
85 [((Donny: lifted eyebrows, smile)]

86 tu- [CIAo tutti! >al)cuni di voi<=
a- [HELLo all-M-PL! >any-PL of you-PL<=
a- [HELLo everyone! >do any of you<=

87 DONNY: [°(m(h) m(h) m(h) m(h)]

88 ANNIE: =>avete lavoro a scuola,<
=>(do-you-PL)have job at school,<
=>have job at school,<

89 (0.2)
90 ANNIE: .hh u:hm .hh

91 [((resumes writing)]
92 [quanto:: (0.8) °la[vo- °
[how much wo[r- °

93 DONNY: [ask about]

94 transporta[tion and ask about
95 ANNIE: [°lavori,°
[° (do-you-SG) work,°
[° do you work,°

96 (1.2)

97 DONNY: [like where they live.]
98 ANNIE: [ogni °s:::]ettima:na::
[every we:::]k::

99 (0.6)
100 DONNY: °i’ll write something as well.°
101 ANNIE: e::::
a::::nd

102 (0.2)
103 DONNY: °sonia’s happy.°
104 (0.9)

105 KITTY: [mh.
106 [°(smiles)]
107 (0.6)

108 CRAIG: [((looking on his computer screen)]
109 [a liar ( of a) facebook.
While Craig and Donny are engaged in constructing the list of topics-so-far, Kitty expands on the subtopics they could explore, were they to talk about campus jobs (>if we did campus jobs< we could a::dd, line 10). For example, they could talk about how students in Italy spend their money, possibly on school supplies and books (lines 13-19). After a brief interruption due to Craig’s and Annie’s search for an outlet for Craig’s computer (lines 20-29), Kitty resumes her prior action: her suggestion to talk about whether students spend their money recreationally or on books (lines 30-32), like most “kids” do (line 34).
In line 35, Annie – who had already tried to get the floor in line 33 – finally manages to get speakership by latching the agreement token ‘yeahº to Kitty’s prior turn. Annie then expresses a positive assessment of the topic “campus jobs” by saying >i think it would be interesting to see.< (line 35). Her final ratification of the proposed topic comes with Annie’s announcement that she is going to write on the Facebook wall (so >i’m gonna write on the wall.<<, line 36), in order to ask the Italians some questions. She then places her hands on the keyboard of her laptop (line 37) as she starts producing the first words of the question: *alcuni han- (“(do) any people have”; line 38). Note that Annie is on the right track, since she starts conjugating the verb form in the third person plural (the complete form is *hanno*), as the indefinite *alcuni* requires. However, she cuts off (*han-), produces the vocalization *uh* (line 38), and turns to her coparticipants (line 40), visibly looking for help. However, they remain silent (line 39) and Annie issues the following first pair part: ‘*alcuni di voi: right?º* (“any of you right?”, lines 41-43). The use of *right* delivered with upward intonation would make a response relevant from her coparticipants. However, by the time she delivers *right* (line 43), Annie’s eye gaze is directed at her screen and she starts typing (line 42). This embodied action thus weakens the relevance of a response, since it displays Annie’s certainty over the repair solution she has just proposed.

The insertion of *di voi* (“of you”, lines 41-43) before the verb form (*han-, line 38) reveals what the trouble source was. When asking a question to a plural audience about the audience itself, the third person plural is not correct: the question introduced by *alcuni han-* would translate as “(do) any people have” (versus “do you have” or “do any
of you have”). Instead, an accurate formulation of the question requires reference to a second person plural subject. The addition of *di voi* targets this issue.

Now, if the matter is settled for Annie who keeps typing (lines 44-45), Craig very quietly declares that he has not understood (*"i don’t understand."*, line 46) what the repair initiation in line 38 was targeting and what Annie’s solution in lines 41-43 has accomplished. Annie’s next turn clarifies these actions. She starts by repeating the first part of the question in Italian, but cuts off (*"alcu-"*, line 48), produces the token *uh*, and finally provides the full version of the projected question in English: >*does anyone have a job on campus* (line 48). The switch to English seems motivated by a reliance on the participants’ L1 as a semiotic resource that guarantees mutual understanding. At this point, Craig claims understanding (*"oh oh", line 49) and acceptance of Annie’s self-completed repair (*"ok", line 49) and Annie repeats the question so far in Italian: >*alcuni di voi*, (“any of you”, line 50; note the emphasis on *voi*). The slightly rising intonation suggests that a continuation of the question is forthcoming. However, Annie encounters some trouble, as indicated by a 0.6 second pause (line 50), by the hesitation token *uh::hm* (line 50), and by her subsequent nonverbal conduct. In fact, during a 2.2 second gap (line 51), Annie lifts her left hand from the keyboard (line 52), moves her head back and looks ahead (line 53), while her facial expression displays uncertainty (line 54). At this point, Craig – who has briefly glanced at Annie (line 55) just in time to see her embodied display of uncertainty – offers a candidate continuation of the question with *‘avete un lavoro?’* (“do you have a job”, line 56). The upward intonation makes a response from Annie relevant. Indeed, after a 0.4 second silence (line 57), Annie displays her
acceptance by typing (line 58) and repeating the verb form suggested by Craig: avete:::
(line 59).

At this point, once the pronoun voi (“you-PL”) has been included in the subject expression alcuni di voi (“any of you”), Annie does not observably orient to hanno (literally, “they have”) as a possible verb form for this subject, despite the fact that hanno would indeed be the correct form (see the discussion at the beginning of this section). Instead, Annie unproblematically accepts Craig’s inaccurate form avete (“you-PL have”). She then spends the following 6.1 seconds typing, while Craig keeps his eye gaze on Annie’s screen (lines 60-61).

Meanwhile, the other two participants are totally disengaged with respect to the activity of collaborative writing that Annie and Craig are performing. Kitty, in fact, utters something very quietly (line 63), while looking in the opposite direction of Annie’s and Craig’s shared focus of attention (lines 62). Donny, on the other hand, is focusing on his screen.

Then Annie, who has been writing all along, provides a continuation of the question with che fate (“what do you do”, line 65). It is not clear whether she has already written this part or whether she is going to write it next. Whatever they case may be, Annie keeps writing (lines 66-67). Then, by saying e:: (“and”) in line 68, Annie projects a further continuation of the question, but a rather long silence follows (line 69) and Annie stops writing (line 70). At this point, Craig – who has kept following the written development of the question on Annie’s screen (line 71) – seems to initiate repair on the question-as-written-artifact. Craig’s action looks as follows: >it would be like< (. ) s:i:
(0.4) “che fate.” (“it would be like yes, what do you do”, lines 72-74). By using the
quotative frame *it would be like* (line 72), Craig is projecting the formulation of an HD line, which is in fact articulated as: *si. che fate* (“yes, what do you do”). In my interpretation, here Craig is suggesting inserting the response token *si* after the first question about campus jobs. In other words, the version of the question-as-emergent-artifact that Craig seems to be suggesting would be: “do any of you have a job on campus? (if) yes, (then) what do you do?” In any case, Annie does not display an actual understanding of Craig’s repair (see also her silence in line 73); rather, she claims a change of state with a soft “*o:h.*” in line 76.

Meantime Donny, who has been silent so far, finally takes the floor and produces the following turn: *i mean everytime michael or annie it goes, (1.1) dear whoevers* (lines 75 and 77-81). With his turn, Donny is mocking Michael’s and Annie’s habit of beginning every post on Facebook with the expression *dear whoevers* (probably Donny’s rendition of Italian *caro/cara*, “dear”, + name of the person, or *cari tutti*, “dear all”). Note how the pause in line 78 serves the purpose of ensuring Annie’s reciprocation of eye gaze (line 79; Goodwin, 1980), while the delivery of *dear whoevers* (line 80) is done with a deeper voice (line 81). That is, after introducing the opening formula of Michael’s and Annie’s posts with the quotative frame *it goes* (line 77), Donny animates (Goffman, 1981) the opening formula, as if the posts were delivered orally, and not in writing. By acting out the opening formula, then, Donny adds evidentiality to the formula itself and makes it somewhat more tangible for his recipients. The remaining part of Donny’s turn is inaudible (line 80).

Now, here is how Annie responds to Donny’s teasing action: *well caro:: tu- CIAo tutti! alcuni di voi avete lavoro a scuola* (“*dear a- hello everyone! do any of you have job
at school”, lines 82-86). Let us unpack Annie’s actions here. She starts with the delivery of the opening formula in Italian. Indeed, note that Annie and Craig – in their collaborative work on the question so far – have not discussed the opening formula. That is, Donny’s action talks into relevance the opening formula, which surfaces for the first time in Annie’s speech with *caro tu*- for *caro tutti* (“dear all”, lines 82 and 85). On the elongation of the last syllable in *caro::* (line 82), Annie briefly glances at Donny (line 83), thereby displaying how the action of saying out loud the opening formula is done for his sake. However, as her eye gaze meets Donny’s, she sees that he has lifted his eyebrows and is smiling (line 84). Annie then goes on to say *tutti*, but cuts off at the first syllable (*tu-*, line 85) and repairs *caro tu-* with *CIAo tutti!* (“hello everyone”, line 85). Note here the higher volume and the stress on *ciao*, as well as the emphatic intonation in the delivery of the whole expression. In overlap with Annie’s self-completed repair, Donny laughs (line 86), while Annie once again briefly glances at him (not marked in the transcript: it occurs while Annie says *-o in ciao and tu- in tutti*, in line 85). It is of course impossible to say which opening formula Annie used in the first place (if any) and whether she actually changed it in the question-as-written-artifact. What counts though, for the purposes of the interaction, is that Annie’s actions, both the delivery of the opening formula (lines 82-85) and the repair from *caro tu-* to *ciao tutti* (line 85), are done in response to Donny’s mocking action.

Annie then delivers the question-so-far >*alcuni di voi avete lavoro a scuola>* (“do any of you have a job at school”, lines 85 and 87) at a faster pace and with a slightly rising intonation that suggests continuation: with her turn, Annie recapitulates the
formulation so far and orients to further elaborating the post she is constructing. Initially, Annie displays some hesitation, as indicated by the pause in line 88 and by the perturbations in line 89. But then she resumes writing (line 90) and delivers the following part of the question: *quanto lavori ogni settimana* (“how much do you work every week”, lines 91, 94, and 97). The cut off *lavo*- (line 91) suggests that Annie might have some trouble in conjugating the verb *lavorare* (“to work”); it is however impossible to determine the exact nature of this trouble.

While Annie is engaged in writing the following part of the question, Donny suggests that she also ask about transportation and about where the students live (lines 92-93 and 96). Then he announces that he is going to write something as well (line 99), so that the teacher, Sonia, will be happy (line 102); Kitty then provides an acknowledgement token to this turn (line 104) and smiles (line 105). Then, both Kitty and Donny orient to some laughable matter (lines 109-110) introduced by Craig’s turn in lines 107-108. Meantime, Annie is continuing the process of creating the question-as-written-artifact, a process which – after the teasing exchange with Donny in lines 75-87 – has become a solitary endeavor. The participants, in fact, are now pursuing different courses of action and the current participation framework shows how each of them is orienting to his/her own computer screen (Annie, Craig, Donny) and notes (Kitty). So, while engaged in completing the question to post on Facebook, Annie projects a continuation with *e:::* (“and”, line 100), while another verb form surfaces in line 113

---

84 Annie here delivers the first part of the question and not *che fate* (“what do you do”), which emerged in the talk in lines 65 (with Annie) and 74 (with Craig). Since I do not have access to the final written artifact (neither in its intermediate nor in its final form), it is impossible for me to say whether Annie actually wrote that part of the question and then erased it or simply did not repeat it here. What is certain, though, is that in lines 117-122 Annie seems to be reading the final version of the question as it appears on the screen and *che fate* is not included.
with *lavora’te:* (“you-PL work”). Then Annie stops writing (line 114) as she utters a conclusive *okay* (line 115). Finally, a resumptive *so* (line 117) that also orients to a new course of action (Bolden, 2006, 2008, 2009; Raymond, 2004; Streeck, 2002) prefaces Annie’s reading of the final version of the question-as-written-artifact: *alcuni di voi avete lavoro a scuola, quanto lavori ogni settimana e dove lavorate* (“do any of you have job at school, how much do you-SG work and where do you-PL work”, lines 117 and 119-122). After a 2.3 second silence (line 123), Craig’s *alright* (line 124) indicates that the activity of formulating the question about campus jobs has now come to an end and the participants indeed orient to a different course of action (i.e., “preferencing” – *sic* – the topics they have mentioned so far).

In summary, the analysis of the fragment in Figure 4.28 has shown how a question-as-written-artifact is the result of collaborative work among the participants. The question is mainly authored by Annie. Note however how the necessary condition for the formulation of the question – be it an individual or a collaborative endeavor – is that agreement has been reached on the possible topic of the presentation. So Annie’s activity of writing the question is made possible by and enacted after the participants’ agreement on “campus jobs” as a viable topic. In other words, the relevance of asking a question on a specific topic is negotiated and accomplished collaboratively, whether the material process of formulating and typing the question is carried out individually or in collaboration with others.

Regarding the material process of writing the question, Annie is clearly the self-selected author in charge, but the writing process – visibly done in a shared environment and in the pursuit of a common goal – is open to the coparticipants’ intervention(s).
Indeed, Craig contributes by attending to the initial formulation of the question and by proposing a candidate continuation of it (*avete un lavoro*, line 56); at the same time, the mocking action performed by Donny determines the surfacing (and the modification) of a part of the question (i.e., the opening formula) which was not publicly negotiated before.

Finally, in terms of the language choices enacted by these participants, a temporary version of the question is formulated in English to ensure mutual understanding (line 48). Other than that, though, the question emerges, bit by bit, stage after stage, in Italian; moreover, Annie’s self-completed repairs from *alcuni han-* (“(do) some people have”, line 38) to *alcuni di voi* (“any of you”; lines 41-43), and from *caro tu-* (“dear a-”, lines 82-85) to *ciao tutti* (“hello everyone”, line 85) are carried out in Italian. Note also that the first of these repairs demonstrates Annie’s orientation to accuracy, even though the final version of the question is not completely correct. Lastly, the analysis of this fragment has also shown how the participants nonverbally attend to each other’s conduct and use local contextual configurations to display their availability for collaborative action or their engagement in individual courses of action.

### 4.5 Summary of findings

The analyses presented in this chapter have focused on collaborative work on emergent linguistic artifacts. These analyses contribute to our understanding of how group planning is collaboratively done and achieved as a situated activity, and extend the body of research conducted so far (Suchman, 1987, 2007; Murphy, 2004, 2005; Roth, 1996) to another type of interactions; i.e., interactions-for-classroom-tasks. The products of these interactions are typically linguistic artifacts, either in oral or in written form.
Specifically, the CA analyses presented here show the distinctive contribution that a behavioral, CA-based approach can give to SLA planning research. Such an approach, in fact, affords a moment-by-moment documentation of what actually happens in the process of planning, thereby allowing us to observe the planning behaviors and the local resources through which the final product is progressively shaped and co-constructed in the interaction among the participants.

Overall, whether students are working on script lines or on Facebook questions, their collaborative planning processes are very similar to the planning processes analyzed in interactions-for-design (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Roth, 1996). As soon as a linguistic artifact emerges on the interactional surface, it becomes publicly accessible and is amenable to modifications and expansions performed by the coparticipants. Modifications include repair operations together with translation and retranslation practices that allow the students to gradually mold their artifact into a (fairly accurate) linguistic product written in Italian. In this process, the students’ knowledge of the L1 and the L2 are clearly crucial resources.

Another resource that plays a fundamental role in the creation of script lines is the use of HD. HD proves in fact to be a depictive device that allows the students to illustrate the plan they envision for their classroom presentation. Through HD the plan is demonstratively formulated in the form of script-lines-as-emergent-artifacts, which are collaboratively shaped until they come to constitute a written script for the presentation.

The analyses carried out in this chapter also illustrate how the process of collective shaping is subject to a number of ratifications, which can be performed either verbally (e.g., with tokens like mh mh, yeah, okay or Italian sì) or nonverbally (e.g., with
head nods, with the embodied actions of erasing or writing). Agreement among the coparticipants is in fact crucial in the collaborative, goal-oriented activity of producing written artifacts. Clearly, the accomplishment of mutual understanding is the necessary condition for agreement to be reached, and various resources are used to ensure understanding, including the use of English in the formulation of an artifact, or the resort to descriptions where demonstrative proposals formulated through HD are not clear enough.

Moreover, during the process of collective molding, the participants display their epistemic positioning with respect to the matter at hand and to each other. To this end, they use verbal and nonverbal resources. What is key is not only the type of embodied action they perform, but also the timing of this action and how it is coordinated with talk. As we have seen in the analysis of the fragments in Figures 4.25.1, 4.25.2, and 4.28, for example, in the environment of repair, a student may well indicate, with her verbal behavior, that a response is relevant from her coparticipant, but her nonverbal conduct (i.e., with a display of incipient engagement in writing) may suggest that she has confidently settled the matter on her own and that she is not waiting for a response in order to start writing the repair outcome.

In any case, it is not only the participants’ individual epistemic statuses/stances that are brought to the fore during planning sessions. The participants in fact may orient to the epistemic authority of online dictionaries and websites or of what has been discussed in class (on this issue, see also: Markee & Kunitz, 2013). Importantly, these exogenous resources are not necessarily treated as superior, and their relevance may be overridden by local interactional purposes (see for example Figure 4.25.1, when Jenny
seems to be orienting to the use of an online resource to solve the spelling issue of *oltre* versus *altre* and eventually decides to settle the matter on her own).

Finally, both the retranslation practices enacted to determine the accuracy of the L2 (for a more thorough discussion of these practices, see Chapter 5) and the trouble sources targeted in repair operations reveal the students’ emic criteria in tackling the planning process and in conceptualizing the planning product. Specifically, it appears that the participants in this study orient to producing a final written artifact that is accurate in spelling and grammar as well as appropriate and varied in the use of vocabulary (at least in one case). These criteria seem to be grounded in the students’ conceptualization of the planning product as a written artifact, a conceptualization which in fact contrasts with the syllabus and the teachers’ conceptualization of the presentation as an essentially oral endeavor that is not necessarily assessed for its grammatical accuracy (for further discussion see Chapters 5 and 6). At the same time, we have also seen a few examples (see sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.4) of repair initiations that appeared to be prompted precisely by the materiality of the written form. A collection of similar cases and a detailed, CA analysis of these instances may actually lead to a respecification of *noticing* (Schmidt, 2010) in behavioral terms (similar to the work that has been done on word searches by Markee & Kunitz, 2013 and Mori & Hasegawa, 2009, and on avoidance by Markee, 2011).

As mentioned above, the students’ knowledge of Italian (the L2) and English (the L1) is essential for the planning process. The students use Italian as the required language-of-the product, while English is their working language or language of the process, used to negotiate, discuss, guarantee mutual understanding, and to verify the
accuracy of L2 forms. Occasionally, however, Italian can also function as the language of the process whenever repair operations are carried out exclusively in this language or when the Italian token *sì* is used to express agreement with a proposed solution and to mark the sequential boundaries between different courses of action. The next chapter will focus on a detailed discussion of these matters.
Chapter 5: L1/L2 alternation practices

5.1 Introduction

During the planning sessions, the students were free to interact in whichever language they chose. As it turns out, the planning sessions were mostly conducted in English, which functioned as the working language or language of the process. Italian, on the other hand, was typically used for the planning product; i.e., the linguistic artifact that the students individually created or collaboratively shaped, be it a script for their presentation or a question to post on Facebook.

The focus of the present chapter will thus be on the practices of language alternation enacted by students engaged in planning work. The chapter aims to demonstrate how language alternation can be a resource for planning and how the specific patterns of alternation that will be identified are enacted for the local and normative management of the interaction, without the need to invoke the students’ lower proficiency in Italian. All four groups of students, in fact, regardless of the proficiency level of the participants, used language alternation as a structuring device to contrast the projected product of the planning process with the talk used in the planning process itself.

A terminological note is now in order. My analysis is framed within the interactional perspective on language alternation/CS. According to this perspective (see section 2.4.4), language choice is a form of social action that derives its meaning and import from its being sequentially situated in talk-in-interaction. Specifically, I adopt Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) distinction between language alternation and CS: language alternation is the superordinate term indicating any use of two languages in a stretch of talk, while CS is a specific type of language alternation that constitutes an instance of
“interactional otherness” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002, p. 1) or “other languageness” (Gafaranga, 2000, p. 336) that is not oriented to as needing repair, but is instead treated as functional to the local interactional purposes.

In order to identify actual instances of CS, analysts need to demonstrate what the medium of interaction is, and whether it is monolingual or bilingual. In Gafaranga’s (2000) words:

It is necessary for analysts to demonstrate the “code” which has been switched from before they [the analysts] can claim that codeswitching has taken place. […] Without a clearly defined base language/code, any instance of language alternation can be taken to be codeswitching. (pp. 327-328)

Thus, as we saw in Chapter 2, the issue is that, in exchanges among multilingual speakers, the medium of interaction may well be bilingual. That is, the participants may conduct their interaction in two languages, without orienting to the ‘otherness’ of either of those languages. When this is the case, language alternation is the norm and, if we operate within an emic perspective, we cannot claim that a codeswitch has occurred, since the use of a different language is not interpreted as noticeable and accountable by the coparticipants. On the other hand, there may be cases when the participants actually orient to the other languageness of a specific turn delivered in a particular language. This is the necessary (but not sufficient)\(^\text{85}\) condition to identify a codeswitch.

My analysis will show how, during the planning sessions, the participants actually adopt a bilingual medium of interaction, which is locally organized to perform planning-related activities, such as formulating script lines and rehearsing for the presentation. In

\(^{85}\) See Chapter 2, section 2.4.4, for a description of the difference between medium repair and codeswitching, which are both instances of other languageness.
this situated endeavor, the participants use Italian to mark the linguistic artifact that is the product of their planning, and English to conduct their interactional business during the planning process. The process versus product distinction represents the main pattern of language alternation found in my data and it constitutes the local interactional order produced by the participants themselves (Cromdal, 2005). I will thus explore this pattern and, within it, the interplay between the L1 and the L2, while in other fragments I will analyze how the participants deviate from the normative interactional order and what they accomplish with these actions.

The chapter is organized as follows. I will first provide a brief overview of three main lines of research conducted within the interactional perspective on language alternation/CS (section 5.2). My work in fact draws on each of them, albeit in different ways. I will then more extensively review the goals and findings of each of these research strands. Specifically, section 5.3 will review Mori’s (2004) and Kasper’s (2004) CA analyses of language alternation in language learning environments; section 5.4 will focus on participant-related and discourse-related switches in the classroom as discussed in previous studies (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Fuller, 2009; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005); finally, section 5.5 will discuss how the process versus product distinction has been presented in previous projects, while focusing on a more extensive review of Cromdal’s (2005) work, since it has inspired the line of analysis I will be conducting on my data.

The analysis will be organized as follows: I will first analyze examples of the process versus product alternation pattern (section 5.6). Subsequently, I will explore the practices that reveal what the interplay between English and Italian looks like (section
5.7). Finally, I will examine instances of deviation from the local interactional order (section 5.8). To conclude, I will provide a brief summary of the main findings (section 5.9).

5.2 Language alternation in the language classroom: three lines of research

Within the interactional perspective there are three main lines of research on classroom language choice, which are identifiable on the basis of their specific analytical focus. More precisely: 1) CA analyses of language learning environments (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004); 2) the medium of interaction as a local interactional order that is co-constructed by the coparticipants (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011; Cromdal, 2005); and 3) the distinction between participant-related and discourse-related switches (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Fuller, 2009; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005). All three use CA as a methodological tool, but whereas lines 1) and 2) adopt only CA as their theoretical framework, line 3) relies on other theories as well. In this section I will briefly sketch the line of inquiry of these three strands.

The first line of research consists of studies that use a strict CA-only framework to explore language learning environments (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004). The main goal of these studies is “to promote an overall sensitivity to the intricacies of classroom talk” (Mori, 2004, p. 536), while also showing the potential of detailed and rigorous CA analyses in the field of SLS. In this research effort, patterns of language choice are not the object of investigation per se; they are nonetheless investigated in that they emerge as relevant practices in the participants’ sequential management and accomplishment of local courses of actions within specific tasks. The two studies in this research strand will be more extensively reviewed in section 5.3.
The second line of research (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011; Cromdal, 2005) also elaborates detailed CA analyses and relies on CA as its only theoretical framework. However, here language choice is the main analytical focus and it is examined by applying Gafaranga’s (2000) terminological framework, which poses a fundamental distinction between language alternation and codeswitching (see sections 5.1 and 2.4.4). Language alternation is the superordinate label referring to any use of two languages in a stretch of talk. CS, on the other hand, refers to a specific type of language alternation, consisting in deviations from current medium that are emically oriented to as functional and therefore as not needing repair. The main concern of researchers in this field is to identify the local interactional order that is co-constructed by bilingual speakers in the classroom. What counts as the “overall order in bilingual classroom talk” (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011, p. 319) is not what is prescribed by school policies as the enforced medium of instruction, but what is actually enacted by the participants. The main goal in fact is that of describing what actually happens in the classroom in terms of language choices as accountable social actions. With these premises, then, the emic notion of medium of classroom interaction seems more adequate, in that it is defined as “the linguistic code’ that classroom participants actually orient-to while talking” (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011, pp. 330-331). In section 5.5 I will more extensively review Cromdal’s (2005) findings in his analysis of the local interactional order that was co-constructed by two children engaged in a classroom task.

Finally, the third line of research (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Fuller, 2009; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005) focuses on language choice and is methodologically based on CA too, but there are important differences with respect to the
other research strands. First of all, in these studies CS is defined as “the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single conversation or utterance” (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005, p. 235). In other words, these researchers use the term CS for the general phenomenon that Gafaranga (2000) calls language alternation. The analytical focus is also different in that these studies do not explicitly look at the overall order of bilingual interaction. Rather, the scholars in this perspective focus on the distinction between participant-related and discourse-related CS (see Chapter 2, section 2.4.4), in an attempt to demonstrate that the language alternation patterns enacted by students in a language classroom are similar to the patterns found in bilingual interactions outside the classroom. Methodologically speaking, these studies are not particularly concerned with furthering the analytical potential of CA (hence the transcripts and the analyses are less detailed) and their theoretical framework extends beyond CA. These scholars in fact integrate a sequential perspective on language alternation with other theories; specifically, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009) frame their work within situated learning theory, while Fuller (2009) adopts a social constructionist perspective on language use. The main findings of their research effort will be summarized in section 5.4.

The present work is indebted to all these lines of research, albeit in different ways. In my analysis I will develop detailed CA analyses of patterns of language alternation as they are performed by students within the local interactional order they co-construct. I will also take into account the distinction between participant-related and discourse-related functions of language switches.
5.3 CA analyses of language alternation in language learning environments

In this section I will report on those studies (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004) that aim at exploring the insights that can be gained through a CA analysis of talk-in-interaction in language learning environments. As mentioned above, these studies do not focus on language alternation per se, but as it emerges in the sequential development of the talk in “conversations for learning” (Kasper, 2004, p. 554). Conversations of this sort are institutional in that they are goal-oriented. Since, in these events, at least one party is a relative novice in some aspects of target language ability, the goal is the improvement of the participants’ interactional competence.

Mori (2004) analyzes a conversation between two intermediate learners of Japanese as a foreign language who are engaged in an oral task: they have to exchange opinions about the topic of gun control. The task goal is to practice the skill of disagreeing and developing counter arguments in their L2. In this data set, language alternation is “a resource for managing sequential boundaries” (Mori, 2004, p. 537); specifically, switches to the L1 (English) mark the initiation of side sequences (Jefferson, 1972) where the participants temporarily suspend the main interactional business (i.e., developing arguments about gun control) in order to display their engagement in word-searches targeting accurate Japanese expressions. Mori’s (2004) findings also show how the L1 often functions as “the unmarked code for talk that deals with metatask, metalanguage, or self-address” (p. 541).

Kasper (2004), on the other hand, examines a stretch of talk within a Gesprächsrunde; i.e., a dyadic conversation for learning between a beginning college student of German as a foreign language and a native speaker of German. During this
activity, a German-only policy is not enforced, but it is understood that the participants make maximum use of German. In her analysis, Kasper focuses on the continuous shift in the situated identities at play during the interaction.

Language alternation, and specifically switches to the L1, are a resource through which the L2 speaker: (a) manages to participate effectively in the interaction in the face of limited L2 means (the L2 speaker is a beginner student); (b) initiates a “metalingual exchange” (Kasper, 2004, p. 551), thereby marking the shift from a conversation on some propositional content to a language learning event. In a metalingual exchange, in fact, the focus is on the linguistic expressions to be used in the interaction, and the identities of native speaker as expert and L2 learner as novice become relevant.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.1 (Kasper, 2004, p. 556) offers an example of these two types of switches to the L1. In the transcript, Italics is used for English; focal turns for the analysis are in boldface.

FIGURE 5.1 – METALINGUAL EXCHANGE INITIATED BY SWITCH TO L1

1  DAGMAR: ich war auch im kino
   I was at the cinema too

2  CINDY: oh: ja [*(film)*]

3  DAGMAR: [ehm ] my big fat greek wedding

4  CINDY: OH:::

5  DAGMAR: der war sehr lustig=
   it was very funny=

6  CINDY: =yeah=

7  DAGMAR: =[ja:]↑a
   =[ye:]↑a

8  CINDY: [it ] was funny um (. ) yeah=

9  DAGMAR: =ja:m
   =yeh

10 CINDY: ich sehe (. ) *auch ( ) erm I- er >i also saw it< ja
    I see  *too

11 DAGMAR: ich seh den film auch,
   I see the film too,
In lines 1-3 Dagmar, the native speaker of German, volunteers some information about what she had done on the weekend in response to previous information from Cindy (not shown) that she had seen a movie. More specifically Dagmar had gone to the movie theatre as well and had watched *My Big Fat Greek Wedding*. Dagmar then issues a positive assessment about the movie with *der war sehr lustig* (“it was very funny”, line 5). At this point, in order to express strong agreement with Dagmar’s first assessment, an upgraded version of the first assessment would be in order (Auer & Uhmann, 1982). Apparently, though, Cindy – the L2 learner – does not have the L2 means (e.g., a stronger evaluative term) that would allow her to perform such an action. She thus resorts to English, her L1, to issue a second assessment (*it was funny*, line 8) and confirm it (*yeah*, line 8). In Kasper’s (2004) words: “By code switching to English, the practice of upgrading by means of a stronger evaluative token in the same language is suspended because the repetition of the same token in a translated version could itself be heard as an upgrade” (p. 560). Furthermore, in this part of the interaction, the two participants do not orient to each other as expert versus novice, but rather as two conversational partners engaged in topical talk. In this case, the L1 is a resource that allows Cindy to move the conversation forward with the semiotic means at her disposal and the switch to the L1 is not interpreted, by either Cindy or Dagmar, as a repairable. A different case, though, arises in line 10. Here in fact Cindy is trying to say, in German, that she saw that movie as well. However, the delivery of her turn is problematic, as indicated by the micropause
and the speech perturbations. She then switches to English, her L1, and this action is interpreted by Dagmar as a request to provide “a surrogate action” (Kasper, 2004, p. 561), so that I also saw it, authored by Cindy in English, is animated by Dagmar as ich seh den film auch (“I see the film too”, line 11). In line 12 Cindy uses English to claim a change of epistemic state (oh) and accept Dagmar’s repair completion (okay). In this brief metalingual exchange, then, the identities of expert and novice are invoked by the participants as relevant in carrying out the business at hand. Crucially, though, the native speaker assumes her role as expert only in response to the L2 speaker’s switch to English, her L1. In this fragment too, then, as in the data presented by Mori (2004), the L1 is used to signal trouble in the formulation of a turn in the L2, but it can also be used as a resource that allows an L2 speaker to aptly and promptly participate in a conversation without interrupting the flow of the interaction.

Overall, Mori’s (2004) and Kasper’s (2004) work shows how CA provides a sequential analysis that accounts for the question “Why that, in that language, right now?” (Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005). Such an account also takes into consideration the epistemic positioning of the coparticipants and their situated identities as they become locally relevant in the unfolding interaction.

5.4 Participant-related and discourse-related switches in the classroom

As mentioned above, Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher (2009), Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005), and Fuller (2009) have mainly focused on participant-related versus discourse-related switches in the classroom. To illustrate this difference, let us consider two examples of CS performed by a teacher in a language classroom. Both examples come
from a German content-based classroom on applied linguistics. In the transcripts, L1 expressions appear in boldface.

The fragment in Figure 5.2 (Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher, 2009, p. 141) represents an instance of discourse-related switching.

FIGURE 5.2 – TEACHERS’ SWITCHING: DISCOURSE-RELATED
1  T: so in welche dieser zwei teile gehört die linguistik-  
   so to which of these two parts does linguistics-
2  die fachsprache der linguistik hinein (.) trick question  
   the technical language belong

In this case, the switch to the L1 (trick question, line 2) indexes the separation between two different courses of action: asking students a question (in the L2) versus meta-commenting on the type of question (in the L1).

The fragment in Figure 5.3 (Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher, 2009, p. 137), instead, illustrates an example of participant-related switching.

FIGURE 5.3 – TEACHERS’ SWITCHING: PARTICIPANT-RELATED
1  T: und beim zweiten satz (.) ist das aussage (.) statement (.)  
   and in the second sentence it’s a statement
2  und der illokutionäre akt ist (.) behaupten (.) state something  
   and the illocutionary act is stating

In this case, both switches (statement, line 1; state something, line 2) are translations of L2 expressions into the L1. This practice reflects the teacher’s anticipation of possible difficulties the students might have in understanding the German expressions. In this sense, then, the teacher is adapting to her coparticipants’ linguistic preferences.

As shown in the examples above, teachers are observed to be using both types of language alternation in the classroom. What about students then? Students have been
frequently observed\textsuperscript{86} to do participant-related switches: upon encountering linguistic problems with their L2, they fall back on the L1 to ensure communication flow and mutual understanding. Language alternation is thus an “attempt to override communicative stumbling blocks” (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005, p. 235).

However, recent studies have shown that L2 learners do switch for discourse-related purposes as well. This practice has been observed for L2 learners at various proficiency levels, from advanced (children and 3\textsuperscript{rd} year college students – studied respectively by Fuller, 2009, and Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005, Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009) to intermediate (Mori, 2004) and early intermediate (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009). For example, the numerous instances of discourse-related switches observed by Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005) served to mark the shift to a different course of action, such as: topic shifts, role shifts, asides, quotations, punch lines, disagreements. These patterns of language alternation are similar to those found in bilingual interaction in general: what L2 learners do is similar to what highly proficient L2 users do inside and outside the classroom. This finding also proves how students orient to the language classroom as a bilingual space, where they can develop the skill of alternating between the languages in their repertoire for local interactional purposes.

Overall, studies on language alternation from the L2 to the L1 in classroom settings that allow L1 use: (a) demonstrate that when students switch to their L1, they may well do so not only “to fill gaps in knowledge of their second language” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009b, p. 185), but also for discourse-related purposes, to structure the organization of talk; (b) advocate a principled use of the L1 in L2 classrooms. If L2

\textsuperscript{86} See for example: Camilleri (1996); Kasper (2004); Lin (1988, 1990); Martin Jones (1995, 2000); Mori (2004); Nussbaum (1990); Zentella (1981).
learners are to become proficient bilingual speakers, they should be given the opportunity to use both languages and therefore to experiment with different patterns of language alternation.

5.5 The process versus product distinction in previous studies

In classroom interaction among students, a common pattern of language alternation for discourse-related purposes is represented by a switch marking the distinction between process and product. That is, in a goal-oriented interaction where the students work on creating a specific linguistic product, they use one language for the product itself, while another language serves as the working language of the interaction; i.e., it is the language through which the process is conducted. This type of pattern is an example of language alternation used to organize talk in a particular way: language alternation works as a structuring device to contrast the projected product of the planning process with the talk used to carry out the planning process itself.

Typically, in an L2 classroom where the students share the same L1 (or a lingua franca), the required language of the product is the L2, while the L1 (or the lingua franca) functions as the language of the process. This is the case in my data as well: during the planning process, the participants mainly use English (their common L1) as their language of the process, while Italian is the required language of the product, in that the presentation is to be performed in Italian; to this end, the students develop scripts in Italian during the planning sessions.

In this section I will trace how the process versus product pattern has been identified and discussed in previous studies. Indeed, numerous examples of this pattern
can be found in the literature on language alternation, even though they have been analyzed from different standpoints and for different analytical purposes.

First of all, studies within the cognitive perspective on CS (see section 2.4.3) do not dwell on the relevance of the process versus product distinction per se, but rather focus on the functions of the L1 as it is used by students to complete a classroom task (see Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). Specifically, in these circumstances, the L1 works as a scaffolding tool in the formulation of L2 sentences and can be utilized for a variety of purposes: to manage the task; to develop a common understanding; to frame problematic L2 forms; to do word searches; to create alternative, periphrastic formulations; to verify the meaning of a sentence in the L2; etc.

Fuller (2009), on the other hand, in her analysis of discourse-related switching, identifies the process versus product distinction as a common alternation pattern regardless of proficiency level. Fuller (2009) treats this pattern as yet another proof that children in a language classroom do switch for discourse-related purposes and are able to use CS as a structuring device that can mark various distinctions: process versus product, on-task versus off-task talk, non-peer-directed versus peer-directed talk.

Fuller’s (2009) data concern 4th and 5th graders, enrolled in dual language programs in Berlin. Specifically, her data come from two different types of English classes: English “mother tongue” classes (i.e., for bilingual children who have English as their L1) and English “partner tongue” classes (i.e., for bilingual children who have English as their L2).

The fragment in Figure 5.4 is an example of the process versus product pattern reported in Fuller (2009, p. 123). The talk is excerpted from an interaction occurring in
an English partner tongue classroom. In this fragment, three German-dominant children are preparing a poster about foxes in L2 English, which is used as the language of the final product, while L1 German is used for planning talk (lines 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10). In the transcript, German expressions appear in Italics; boldface is used for focal turns in the analysis.

FIGURE 5.4 – STUDENTS’ CODESWITCHING

1 Q: *sie sind also*, they are not very organized, *they are then*,

2 also, *damit meine ich sie machen ganz wie*, so, by that *i mean they just do like*,

3 O: you can’t train them.

4 Q: *gezüchtet*, right. *bred*,

5 O: you can’t train them very good.

6 Q: you can’t tame them.

7 G: they’re not *stubenrein*. *housetrained*

8 *damit meine ich dass* by that *i mean that*

9 G: they’re not *stumeable*.

In instances like this, one could argue that the speakers use the L1 because their higher proficiency in that language allows them to effectively move the task along. However, Fuller (2009) observed a similar process versus product distinction with English-dominant children in an English mother tongue classroom: they use their L1 as the required language for the final product, but do the accompanying talk in the L2.

In such circumstances, the proficiency argument does not hold and the only purpose of language alternation is to structure the conversation. That is, overall patterns of language alternation are the same regardless of proficiency levels (Fuller, 2009, p. 129;
The particular pattern described above allows for a “distribution of labor across languages” (Fuller, 2009, p. 121), each marking different actions performed during task preparation. Specifically, these actions include: (a) trying out possible formulations for the final task (in the language required for that task); (b) doing planning talk.

What I would like to argue, though, is that the analysis can be taken one step further. A closer look at the fragment in Figure 5.4, for example, would show how the formulations in the L2 display the children’s attempt to come up with a list of features characterizing foxes and how the L1 is used as the working language of the process (lines 1-2, 8, and 10), but – more importantly – to propose specific adjectival expressions (gezüchtet, “bred”, line 4; stubenrein, “housetrained”, line 9). Through the formulations in the L2 and the expressions in the L1, the children collaboratively get to the L2 word tameable (line 11). The children’s interactional work displays their shared orientation to an adequate description of foxes done with accurate vocabulary. It is with this type of more detailed analysis, anchored in the local interactional situation and its sequential organization, that we can gain a deeper understanding of L1/L2 alternation patterns and of the participants’ interactional purposes as they switch between the languages in their repertoire.

In the remaining part of this section I will more extensively review Cromdal’s (2005) study, which – inspired by Gafaranga’s (2000) work – is mainly concerned with the local interactional order that is co-constructed by the participants in interaction. In Cromdal’s (2000, 2003, 2005) findings and in other studies of children’s interactions (Green-Vänttinen, 1996; Guldal, 1997), the process versus product distinction is an
embodiment of such order, implicitly or explicitly agreed upon and enacted by bilingual children as they are engaged in playful activities or in classroom tasks. The process versus product pattern, then, is not an instance of CS, but embodies a “division of labor” (Cromdal, 2005, p. 333) in the bilingual medium of interaction (Gafaranga, 2000) that organizes the children’s activity and that constitutes the scheme of interpretation (Garfinkel, 1967) through which the children make sense of their actions. In Cromdal’s (2005) words: “The children establish a normative order of language use as part of their interactional organization” (p. 334).

Cromdal’s (2005) data were collected in a 4th grade classroom in an English school in Sweden. In the school, interactions with the staff and all the educational materials are in English, but the students are free to choose whichever language they prefer when working with their peers. The data analyzed in 2005 consist of 55 minutes of videotaped interaction between two 10 year old students preparing a short paper on housing among well-born people in Victorian England. The paper had to be written in English. The students, sitting at a computer table, are thus engaged in collaborative writing. In performing this activity, the participants produce and sustain a bilingual interactional order characterized by “normative features which serve as a resource for the girls’ production and interpretation of accountable actions” (Cromdal, 2005, p. 338).

In this locally produced order, English is used when formulating expressions to be included in the paper, while Swedish is the working language of the interaction. The normative character of such an organization emerges when the interactional patterns established in the local interactional order are suspended or violated. These instances of suspension/violation, in fact, produce accountable actions that need to be explained
against the normative interactional order by analyzing the local management of the unfolding interaction.

Let us examine the fragment reproduced in Figure 5.5 (Cromdal, 2005, p. 346). In the transcript, expressions in English appear in boldface. Ebba and Lara are working together on their composition; Jean is a passer-by coming to borrow something from the computer table where Ebba and Lara are sitting.

**FIGURE 5.5 – I DON’T WANNA LEAVE THE COMPUTER**

1. **EBBA:** [((sounding out the syllable while writing))]
   \[\textbf{b:eu}: - (.).\]

2. [((looks up at Lara))]
   [säg du hur du stavar]
   [tell me how you spell]

3. ((Jean, at table nearby, comes up facing the girls))

4. **JEAN:** kan ja få låna din::ö:
   can i borrow your eeh

5. **EBBA:** näe=
   nope

6. **JEAN:** öoh
   eerm

7. ((Lara and Ebba turn back to the computer))

8. ((Lara reaches over the keyboard; Ebba fences off her hand))

9. **EBBA:** näe (3.0) \(^{\circ}(\textbf{beau})^{\circ}\textbf{tfi}[l
    \text{nope}
   []

10. **JEAN:** [lara:

11. **LARA:** a↑:
    y↑::h

12. **JEAN:** kan ja få låna din:öh din:ö:h
    can I borrow your eh your eeh

13. **LARA:** [((eyes on the manuscript))]

14. [i don’t wanna leave the computer]

15. ((Jean turns to leave))

16. **EBBA:** [((points in manuscript))]

17. [^\(^{\circ}(här)^{\circ}\) (1.5) de ska ju inte finnas nåt u!
    there’s not supposed to be a u!]
In lines 1-4 the local interactional order produced by Ebba and Lara is clearly visible: Ebba is engaged in writing the word *beautiful* in the paper but is uncertain about its spelling. She thereby produces the first syllable of the word in English (*b:eu:*, line 2), but cuts it off and uses Swedish to ask Lara how to spell it (line 4). At this point, a third girl – Jean – approaches the pair (line 5) and asks them, in Swedish, whether she can borrow something from the computer table (line 6). Ebba rejects Jean’s request in Swedish (lines 7 and 11), while both Lara and Ebba turn back to the computer (line 9), thereby displaying their orientation to resume their prior activity. Jean, however, now issues her request to Lara (lines 12 and 14). While, upon being summoned (line 12), Lara replies to Jean with Swedish *a:::* (“yes”, line 13), she then switches to English in her response to Jean’s request (*i don’t wanna leave the computer*, line 16). Note that Lara’s turn is not a straightforward rejection of Jean’s request, but rather provides an account which constitutes an implicit rejection: she does not want to leave the computer, therefore she cannot comply with Jean’s request of borrowing something from the computer table. At this point, Jean turns to leave (line 17) and the other two participants resume their activity of collaborative writing while restoring the usual order of language choice: Swedish for the process, English for the product (lines 18-20). To sum up, Lara’s use of English in line 16 represents a temporary suspension of the interactional order that normatively organizes the participants’ activity of collaborative writing. As such, it represents an actual instance of CS according to Gafaranga’s (2000) definition: it’s an instance of *interactional otherness* (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002; see Chapter 2, section ...
2.4.4) that is oriented to as functional and not needing repair. But what does the switch to English exactly accomplish here? In Cromdal’s (2005) interpretation, the suspension of the usual interactional order serves the purpose of conveying a noncompliant response: in the face of Ebba’s open rejection, a second straightforward rejection in the same language might be too strong. Thereby Lara tries to mitigate her action, while still doing a dispreferred. Note also that her eye gaze is disengaged from Jean (line 15), as she switches to English to provide a reason for her implicit noncompliance.

The main point in Cromdal’s (2005) analysis, then, is that the two girls produce a specific bilingual order of interaction as a situated local achievement. There may well be “structural constraints inherent in the specific pedagogical setting” (Cromdal, 2005, p. 350), in that English is the required language for the final product as well as the language used in the materials at the students’ disposal (i.e., a textbook on the Victorian era, an encyclopedia, and a handwritten manuscript of part of the paper). However, the relevance of these constraints for actual conduct “is negotiated as part and parcel of the girls’ organization of the task activity” (Cromdal, 2005, p. 350). Moreover, proficiency is not an issue here, therefore the substantial use of Swedish cannot be attributed to a preference for this language. Indeed, recordings of play activities show how these students were able to interact both in Swedish and in English. The specific interactional order enacted by the coparticipants, then, is a local accomplishment and a resource that allows them to organize and recognize their actions. At the same time, deviations from the normative interactional order (like the switch to English to convey a dispreferred action in Figure 5.5 above) generate an *otherness* that makes them “interactionally
meaningful” (Cromdal, 2005, p. 350). Ultimately, they need to be accounted for in the sequential details of the unfolding interaction.

As mentioned above, the present study follows the interactional approach to language alternation, and more specifically uses Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) terminology. Furthermore, this study draws on all three lines of interactional research on language alternation/CS that I briefly illustrated in section 5.2. I will in fact provide a detailed CA analysis of various instances of language alternation in a language learning environment (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004) in order to describe the local interactional order co-constructed by groups of students (Cromdal, 2005) engaged in planning a classroom presentation. This type of analysis will also allow me to show how the students use language alternation both for participant-related and discourse-related purposes (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Fuller, 2009; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005).

More precisely, there are various similarities between Cromdal’s (2005) data and the data collected for my dissertation. In both settings, the participants are free to interact in whichever language they prefer and they enact a local interactional order where the alternation between two languages embodies the distinction between process and product. Specifically, during the planning sessions that are the object of my study, English is the working language of the process and Italian is the language of the final product. This order is maintained whether the participants engage in collaborative writing (as with the participants in Cromdal’s study) or in some other planning-related activity (such as rehearsing the presentation).

However, a detailed, sequential CA analysis of my data will show how, at specific moments in the interaction, there can be instances of deviations from the normative
interactional order accomplished by the participants. For example, English can become a temporary language of the product, while Italian may temporarily be used as the language of the process, albeit in a very limited way. Following Cromdal’s (2005) work, I will thus examine these and other instances of deviation from the local interactional order. In addition, I will explore the interplay between the L1 and the L2, in order to gain insights into the students’ orientations to the two languages and to their local, interactional functions when planning a task to be performed in the L2. Finally, the fragments presented below will also be analyzed with specific attention to the students’ use of the L2.

Overall, then, the present chapter will show how language alternation is a useful resource during the planning process. CA is used as a methodological tool and as a theoretical framework, which aims at developing emic and sequential accounts of patterns of language alternation in general and of CS in particular. The analyses conducted here will also explore the potential that CA has in investigating language learning environments (in this case, planning sessions), in which two languages are used to produce meaningful actions through situated practices.

5.6 L1 and L2 as resources to mark the process versus product distinction

As section 5.4 has illustrated, students frequently use language alternation to mark two different actions: (a) trying out various formulations in the language required for the final task; (b) doing planning talk in another language. When this is the case, the process versus product distinction is the principle that organizes the students’ activity as it is done in and through talk-in-interaction.
In L2 classrooms, the expected language of the product is the L2, whereas the L1 is often used for planning talk. However, the analyses presented here will show that the students may use both languages (L1 English and L2 Italian) for both the planning outcome and for the planning process. Specifically, the students may use their L1 as a temporary language of the product. At the same time, the students may partially conduct the planning process in the L2. In the following sections, I will show how the participants modify the planning product through practices of repair and translation, both individually (section 5.6.1) and collaboratively (section 5.6.2); I will also illustrate other-directed searches as a specific collaborative practice (section 5.6.3) that is a resource for planning (see Markee & Kunitz, 2013). I will then focus on the use of English as a temporary language of the product (section 5.6.4) and on the use of Italian as a temporary language of the process (section 5.6.5).

5.6.1 Self-repair and translation

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.6 shows how the participants individually modify the script line they have created so far through practices of self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977) and translation. The fragment is an excerpt from group A’s second planning session. In this fragment the participants create: (i) two lines transitioning from Mary’s individual presentation to the final part, and (ii) the line that will introduce the first topic of that part; i.e., *aperitivo* (“aperitif”), the first course in an Italian meal.

FIGURE 5.6 – TRANSITIONING TO THE FINAL PART (Group A, Session 2)

```
1 JOHN: > (you/it) could just be like < lucy, u[:i:]h ] (.)
2 LUCY: [yeah.]
3 JOHN: vuole parlare,
      (does–she) want to-talk,
  (0.3)
4 JOHN: u:hr (0.2) vuoi    parla, uh (.)
      (do–you-SG) want talks, do you want talks,
```
In lines 1-6 John formulates a transitioning line that designates Lucy as the presenter of *aperitivo*. His proposal is preceded by a quotative frame (Couper-Kuhlen, 2007; Golato, 2000, 2012) in English (>(you/it) could just be like<, line 1), but the proposal itself is formulated in Italian. Its final version is as follows: *Lucy, vuoi parlare di aperitivo?* (“Lucy, do you want to talk about aperitif?”). John gets there via two self-repairs. The first repair targets the modal *vuole* (“she wants/(does) she want”, line 3), replaced with *vuoi* (“you want/(do) you want”, line 5); the second repair targets *parla* (“she talks”, line 5), replaced with *parlare* (“to talk”, line 6). These repairs display

---

87 John’s confusion here might be related to the fact that, in Italian, the third person singular form is used to address the interlocutor in the formal register; i.e., *vuole* could be the formal equivalent of *vuoi*. 
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John’s orientation to linguistic accuracy. Note also how he solves these linguistic problems in Italian (he repairs the L2 with the L2), without using any metalanguage.

John then completes his proposal by adding the Italian phrase *di aperitivo* (“about aperitif”, line 6). Once Mary accepts his proposal (*okay*=*yeah*, line 8), John suggests the second pair part that Lucy could issue in response to the invitation to talk about *aperitivo*: *oh. s:i:. (.) certo* (“Oh. Yes. Sure”, line 9). Here too, the script line – formulated in Italian – is preceded by a quotative frame in English (*and you would be like*, line 9).

In overlap with John’s turn, Mary produces another quotative frame in English (*and you could be like*, line 10), followed by a script line in Italian: *OKAY oggi cominciamo con, ... aperitivo* (“Okay. Today we start with aperitif”, lines 11 and 15).89 With her turn, Mary gives her own formulation of Lucy’s second pair part (*OKAY*, line 11) and suggests the very first line that Lucy could say in introducing the new topic. Lucy quickly accepts (*yeah*, line 12) and positively assesses the line-so-far with *cool* (line 14). The slightly rising intonation on *aperitivo* suggests a possible continuation and, indeed, after a 0.6 second silence (line 16), Mary takes the floor with *uhm* (line 17) and then extends the line she is creating for Lucy. However, Mary’s eye gaze (line 17) which is temporarily disengaged from her coparticipants and the hesitation token *uhm* suggest that Mary is encountering incipient trouble in the formulation of the second part of the line and that a search is underway. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the fact that Mary – who so far has managed to develop the script line in Italian – now resorts to English with *today we have* (line 18). Mary then translates this part of the line in Italian,

---

88 The token *oh* could be either English or Italian. Given the context where it is used, I take this instance to be in Italian.

89 *Okay* is a high frequency English loan word that is used in ordinary conversation among Italian speakers. I therefore take the whole line, starting from its very beginning with *okay*, as formulated in Italian.
eventually getting to: oggi: ... abbiamo: (line 19). The translation process, however, does not prove easy, as indicated by the nonlexical perturbations, the pauses, and the cut-off "w-" (possibly standing for we) in line 19. Finally, Mary produces the Italian verb form abbiamo (“we have”, line 19) and offers a temporary completion of the line in English with “what have you.” (line 23), which substitutes for the rest of the turn and characterizes the plan-so-far as not fully developed.90

Overall, this fragment is a clear example of language alternation being used as a structuring device to contrast the planning talk (in the L1) with the planning product (in the L2). In addition, though, the fragment shows that, if the formulation in the L2 is problematic, the students may temporarily use their L1 as the language of the product (see Mary’s talk in line 18). Once the corresponding translation into Italian has been produced (line 19), a codeswitch to the L1 as the temporary language of the product (line 23) may signal that the plan-so-far is not completely articulated. These behaviors thus reveal a complex pattern in the use of language alternation for discourse-related purposes. Furthermore, the analysis of L2 use in this fragment – particularly in the instances of self-repair enacted by John (line 5) – has revealed the participants’ orientation to linguistic accuracy during the planning process and their ability to repair Italian with Italian. It is in this sense that instances of self-repair that are initiated and completed in Italian can be used simultaneously as both language of the product and language of the process.

90 If the interpretation of Mary’s "w-" (line 18) as a cut-off for we is correct, the fact that she does not produce the equivalent Italian pronoun noi, but rather goes straight to the verb form (abbiamo, “we have”, line 18) may be quite meaningful. It may in fact be taken as an indication of Mary’s knowledge that, in Italian, the subject pronoun does not need to be expressed, since the subject is already encoded in the verb form.
5.6.2 Collaborative translation and repair

Repair and translation are not always individual endeavors, performed by one student alone. As we have seen in Chapter 4, the students in groups A, B, and C do engage in the collaborative planning of script lines and questions. When this is the case, repair and translation may be done as joint, cooperative actions. Specifically, by collaboratively repairing the script-lines-as-emergent-artifacts, the participants display their shared orientation to the accuracy of the final, written product.

The fragment in Figure 5.7 is an example of these practices. It is an excerpt from group A’s second planning session. Here the participants write the part of the script where they list the topics of the students’ individual presentations as if they were the specials of the day served at the imaginary restaurant Pasta Hut.

FIGURE 5.7 – TYPES OF ITALIAN RESTAURANTS (Group A, Session 2)

1  JOHN: but (i’m) i’m not talking about the:: u:h (.) the courses.  
2       right?  
3       (0.2)  
4  JOHN: i’m talking about the: (0.7) [u:h ]  
5  LUCY: [types] of-  
6  JOHN: types of restaurants.  
7  LUCY: [yeah. ]  
8  MARY: [o::h! ][sorry. (.) no wonder.  
9       [((moves pen on notebook))]

![Image of a notebook page with Italian text: Ogni, le specialità sono:
- Il ristorante Italo-Americano
- I tipi di ristoranti Italiani
- L’etichetta in Italian

Figure 5.8. The specials of the day (Mary’s script, group A)
In lines 1-9 the participants solve a misunderstanding that arose about the topic of John’s presentation: he will not be talking about the courses of an Italian meal (line 1), but about the types of (Italian) restaurants (lines 4-6). Mary apologizes for the misunderstanding (line 8) and scratches out the word (possibly in line 9) she had
previously written in the script (Figure 5.8). She then names the first topic/special: Italian-American restaurants (lines 11-12); this topic – already finalized in the script (Figure 5.8) – will be presented by Lucy. The listing intonation in line 12 projects the forthcoming formulation of the next item on the list (Jefferson, 1991). This item has been previously offered in English by Lucy (line 5) and John (line 6) as the types of restaurants. After Mary’s display of uncertainty (see the pauses and the token u:hm in lines 13-15), Lucy starts providing the Italian formulation of the item with i tipi: (“the types”, line 16). Mary accepts Lucy’s translation by incorporating it in tipi di ristoranti? (“types of restaurants”, line 17). The rising intonation indicates that Mary is offering this translation for confirmation, which comes with Lucy’s sì (“yes”, line 18). Note how this use of Italian sì deviates from the local interactional order and Italian is here used as the language of the process. A more specific account of this and other similar cases will be provided in subsection 5.6.5.1 below.

Finally, Mary ratifies the translation by starting to write in her notebook (lines 19-20; see also Figure 5.8). Lucy then provides a continuation for the line-so-far and does so in Italian: the next topic/special will be the types of restaurants di Italia (“of Italy”, line 21). Mary accepts this addition with a head nod (line 23), while John elaborates Lucy’s suggestion by saying ristoranti italiano (“Italian restaurants”, line 24). With his turn, John other-repairs di Italia (“of Italy”) with the adjective italiano (“Italian”). However, the number agreement in John’s formulation is not accurate: ristoranti is plural, while italiano is singular. Mary and Lucy at first accept John’s alternative (line 26), but when

---

91 As visible in Figure 5.8, the word she had written is i pasti (“the meals”): not only had she misunderstood the topic of John’s presentation, she had also provided the wrong translation for it by writing pasti (“meals”) instead of piatti (“courses”).

92 Note the accurate formulation of this topic in the script (with singular ristorante, Figure 5.8) versus Mary’s inaccurate oral formulation (with plural ristoranti, line 12).
Mary – engaged in writing (lines 27-29) – repeats the line-so-far, she corrects the agreement problem with "<ris::toranti>" italiani? (“Italian restaurants”, line 29), delivering the accurate adjective italiani with higher volume and rising intonation. This repair seems rather similar to the cases of ‘noticing in writing’ that were described in Chapter 4. The difference, though, seems to lie in the fact that – while in the other examples the repair was prompted by the action of seeing a written form – here the repair seems to be triggered by the action of writing itself. Finally, John accepts Mary’s correction with yeah (line 31), then all the participants nod (line 33) and John repeats, with downward intonation, the part of the line just repaired (ristoranti italiani, line 34).

The alternation practice enacted in this fragment is discourse-related: a switch to Italian marks the beginning of collaborative work on a portion of the script (line 12), whereas a switch to English (line 31) ratifies the outcome of this work and marks the end of it. Specifically, the participants make exclusive use of Italian to engage in collaborative translation work (lines 16-18), expand the line-so-far (line 21), and collaboratively repair it (lines 24 and 28-29). It could then be argued that, here, Italian is employed both as language of the product and as language of the process. Furthermore, as in Figure 5.6, the participants orient to linguistic accuracy, as manifested through the action of other-repairing Italian with Italian.

In summary, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 5.6 and 5.7 has shown how the participants use language alternation in a variety of discourse-related functions and with patterns that are not limited to the contrast between process and product. At the same time, a close analysis of repair sequences conducted in the L2 has revealed the participants’ orientation to linguistic accuracy during the planning process.
5.6.3 Collaborative searches in mid turn

A specific practice of collaboration is enacted when a student, while producing a sentence in Italian, encounters trouble in mid turn, at a point of “maximum grammatical control” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 93). A search emerges from the trouble; self-directed at first, it is then transformed into a collaborative search where the problematic item is conveyed in English. This type of practice will be illustrated in Figures 5.9 and 5.10 below.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.9 is an excerpt from group C’s fourth planning session. Here Annie is about to “wing” (her own term) her individual presentation. At this moment of the interaction, in fact, Annie does not have a written script yet; she will create one only after rehearsing her presentation. This testifies to her more advanced proficiency level in Italian.

FIGURE 5.9 – HOW DO YOU SAY RESEARCHED? (Group C, Session 4)

1 ANNIE: okay. (0.5) .hh (0.3) >i’m not gonna do it in italian.
2 °i’m (gonna do) in< english.°
3 DONNY: okay.
4 (6.6)
5 ANNIE: u:hm. (0.6) okay. (1.0) so:::, (0.4) ciao::.
6 mtch- (.) i:o ho– oh. i thought >(i was not gonna do
7 i: have–
8 it in ºitalianº).< i’ll jus:::- (.i’ll do a mixed.
9 (0.3) okay. .hh so ciao. (0.5) u:hm (0.2) io ho:
10 i (i)have:
   i have:
11 [(2.3)
12 [((Annie looks up))]
13 ANNIE: [((slightly tilts head to Donny and glances at him))]
14 [how do you say researched?]
15 (.)
16 ANNIE: ho ricercato,
   (i)have researched,

Despite announcing that she is going to wing her presentation in English and not in Italian (lines 1-2), as soon as she starts rehearsing her presentation, Annie reproduces the
usual interactional order which contrasts the product, expressed in Italian, with the process, conducted in English. Annie in fact delivers the first words of her presentation in Italian: *ciao:: ... io ho* (“Hi. I have”, lines 5-6). She produces a glottal stop after the verb form *ho* and, after a change of state token (*oh*, line 6), she topicalizes the fact that she did indeed use Italian despite her original intentions (*i thought > (i was not gonna do it in “italian”) <*, lines 6-7) and announces that she will use both languages (*i’ll jus:::- (.) i’ll do a mixed*, line 7).

Annie then starts over again and repeats the exact words she delivered in lines 5-6: *ciao. ... io ho* (“Hi. I have”, line 8). A long pause follows (line 9), during which Annie looks up (line 10), thereby indicating that a word search is underway. Not able to find a solution by herself, Annie slightly tilts her head to Donny and briefly glances at him (line 11) as she verbalizes the search and directs it at her coparticipants with the question: *how do you say researched?* (line 12). After just a micropause (line 13), though, Annie manages to come up with a solution: *ho ricercato* (“I have searched”, line 14). Annie’s talk is then abruptly interrupted by a joke initiated by Donny (not shown in the transcript); once the joke sequence is over, Annie resumes her run-through of the presentation, which is then entirely done in Italian.

This fragment shows how Annie encounters trouble in the delivery of a turn in Italian, specifically in the production of the past participle (*ricercato*, “researched”); she thus pauses after the production of the auxiliary (*ho*, “I have”), engages in a private search, then other-directs it at her coparticipants. To do so, she resorts to English,

---

93 In light of this word search, it is striking that Annie abandoned the production of her turn in Italian in lines 5-6 exactly after the auxiliary *ho* (“I have”). This might suggest that she had had a problem with the past participle from the very beginning. However, the data do not offer any
which is then used to carry out the process and to convey a problematic part of the product (i.e., researched as a temporary version of ricercato).

The fragment in Figure 5.10 is extracted from group B’s second planning session. At the beginning of this session Jenny shows Emily a website where she found nice pictures of Carnival in Venice and the participants discuss – on the basis of the outline they created the day before – the possible topics for Jenny’s individual presentation: Carnival foods, masks, and events. (For more details see Figure 5.17 below: it reproduces the stretch of talk just prior to the one exhibited in Figure 5.10).

FIGURE 5.10 – I DON’T KNOW HOW TO SAY COMMON (Group B, Session 2)

1 JENNY: but (.) I don’t think I’ll get into like anything more about it. (0.2)
2 JENNY: >’cause I mean it’s kind o’ random.<

3 [{(0.2)
4 [{(Emily nods)}

5 JENNY: or=
6 EMILY: =yeah. (0.4)

7 JENNY: and then [say like maybe:]
8 EMILY: [no. i agree. ]

9 (0.3)
10 EMILY: °°yeah.°°
11 (0.4)

12 JENNY: [yeah.
13 [{(looks at Emily)}

14 [and also like (1.0)
15 [{(turns to look at computer screen)}

16 [è::::::::::::::: (0.5)
17 [{(it)i:::::::::::::s
18 [{(looks down)}

19 [i don’t know how to say
20 [{(looks ahead)}

21 evidence that supports this interpretation (e.g., there is no evidence that a word search is underway in line 6 after the delivery of the auxiliary).
After creating a script line introducing the topic “food” (see Figure 5.17 below), Jenny announces that she will not get into many details about that topic (lines 1-2). While agreement between the coparticipants is being established (lines 5-6, 8, 11, 13, and 15), Jenny orients to the formulation of a second script line introducing puppet shows as a specific Carnival event. She thus produces a first, more elaborate, quotative frame in line 10 (and then say like maybe:) and then a second frame in line 17 (and also like). During the delivery of this frame, Jenny turns to look at the computer screen (line 18), possibly
to look for the name of her next topic (i.e., puppet shows) and/or for more information about it. As soon as she starts producing the copula è (“is”, line 19), Jenny looks down (line 20). This nonverbal behavior signaling disengagement from her coparticipant and from the prior focus of attention (i.e., the screen), the elongation of the verb form (è: : : : : : : “is”, line 19) and the following pause (line 19) all indicate unfolding trouble. And in fact, in lines 21-24, Jenny declares that she does not know how to say *common* in Italian. Note that Jenny’s eye gaze is directed ahead (line 22) as she says *i don’t know how to say* (line 21), but as she delivers the trouble source *common* (line 23), she turns to look at Emily (line 24). That is, Jenny’s search starts as a private, self-directed action, which then becomes other-directed by virtue of Jenny’s nonverbal action of turning to Emily and looking at her as a recipient whose response is now made relevant. A verbal admission of not-knowing is nonverbally transformed into a request for help. Here too, then, as in the fragment in Figure 5.9, a problematic item to be inserted in the linguistic artifact is temporarily conveyed in English and framed within a word search. The subsequent part of this fragment will be analyzed more in detail in subsection 5.6.5.2 (Figure 5.22). For now, suffice it to say that Jenny verbalizes her request for help in Italian with *come si dice common?* (“how do you say common”, line 26); eventually the participants settle on the (inaccurate) form *tipiche* (“typical”, lines 28-30), which is finally inserted in the script line *e è tipiche per il festivali avere puppet shows* (“and it is typical for the festival to have puppet shows”, lines 32-34).\(^4\)

\(^4\) The form *tipiche* is inaccurate, since – when the subject of a sentence is an infinitive (in this case, *avere puppet shows*, “to have puppet shows”) – the adjective in the nominal predicate should be in its default form; i.e., in the masculine singular form. Instead, *tipiche* represents the feminine plural form of *tipico*. However, the students do not orient to this as an issue.
In summary, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 5.9 and 5.10 has shown how the participants, in the midst of delivering a script line in Italian, encounter some trouble with a specific item and generate verbal and nonverbal displays of a private search. They then resort to English to ask for the coparticipants’ help (Figure 5.9) or to admit their lack of knowledge, thereby preannouncing a request for help (Figure 5.10). The problematic next due item in the artifact is then announced in English.

5.6.4 English as a temporary language of the product

The previous section has illustrated how the local interactional order works: English is used for planning talk, Italian for the planning product. The analysis, though, has also shown how English can temporarily work as the language of the product and Italian as the language of the process. In the next subsections I will describe these practices in more detail. Specifically, I will show how the participants, at different stages of their planning work, may formulate script lines in their L1 (subsection 5.6.4.1), and how they resort to their L1 when they encounter trouble in the delivery of a turn in Italian (subsection 5.6.4.2) or when the projected slot for the “focus” of a sentence is not readily completed (subsection 5.6.4.3).

5.6.4.1 Formulating scriptlines in the L1

This subsection shows a practice observed in group A’s planning sessions. The fragments in Figures 5.11 and 5.12 illustrate how the participants, at different stages of their planning, may formulate script lines in English. In these cases, script lines emerge in English and the L1 is used to propose what the student-presenters might say and do during their presentation. Whether the participants orient to an immediate translation of English into Italian depends on the planning stage they have reached. More specifically,
in the earlier stages of the students’ planning work (i.e., during the first two planning sessions), the L1 is used to negotiate possible alternatives in terms of the presentation’s format and content; in these stages, the students are engaged in the ideational phase of their planning and the relevance of translating a script line into Italian is not immediate. On the contrary, when the students have reached later stages of their planning, the decisional component of planning becomes crucial. The participants in fact need to decide what to do, they need to agree on a possible formulation of their linguistic artifacts and therefore they orient to the relevance of translating into Italian what they have agreed on.

Figure 5.11 reproduces Figure 4.12.1 in Chapter 4.

FIGURE 5.11 – NOW YOU KNOW WHERE YOU GO (Group A, Session 3)

1 MARY: [((looking at her notes))]
2 "let’s see:. (.) so::: (.) that transitions into]=
3 JOHN: [ ((snorting)) ]
4 MARY: [=john’s, and then jo:hn do you wanna: (0.4)
5 [transition: (.) to the last one, or do you want me
6 [to:: (0.2) just kind of (0.2)
7 LUCY: "start talking?"=
8 JOHN: =>a’n’t you talking about etiquette?<=okay.
9 i’ll be like (.). hhh (.). now you know, (0.2)
10 where you go:,
11 (0.4)
12 MARY: m[h.]
13 JOHN: [we]’ll tell you what to do when you get there.
14 (0.3)
15 MARY: [okay.=
16 [((Mary and Lucy nod))]
17 JOHN: =so i’ll say that in italian.
18 (0.6)
19 so::: u:h .hhh (.). adesso, (0.6) #u:::h# (0.9) sapere. now, to-know.

sapete?=
(you-PL)know?= you know?=
This fragment is extracted from the third planning session, where the students have already agreed on the topic, the structure, and the format of their presentation. Specifically, the fragment picks up the interaction when the participants have just formulated the transitioning line from Lucy’s to John’s individual presentation and are engaged in formulating a transitioning line leading from John’s presentation on types of Italian restaurants to Mary’s presentation on Italian dining etiquette. In line 8 John re-asserts Mary’s topic and then goes on to formulate what he might say: *i’ll be like (.) hhh (.) now you know, (0.2) where you go; ... we’ll tell you what to do when you get there* (lines 9-10 and 13). As soon as Mary and Lucy display their agreement (lines 15-16), John orients to the relevance of a translation, by announcing that he will translate the line into Italian (line 17). The translation work starts right away (lines 19-22).

The fragment in Figure 5.12 is extracted from group A’s first planning session.

**FIGURE 5.12 – HERE IS HOW YOU SHOULD EAT (Group A, Session 1)**

1  MARY: so maybe- so maybe i’ll talk about >(like)< a little (. ) bit of: (0.4) etiquette,=but then

3  [also a little] bit of the orders of the:

4  JOHN: [that’s good. ]

7  JOHN: oh yeah.=»you should do etiquette,< (0.3) like first. like here is how you should eat, (0.2) and then you eat.

11  MARY: [okay.

12  [((Mary and Lucy nod))}
At this early stage of their planning work, the students are discussing about the subtopics of their individual presentations. In lines 1-3 Mary tentatively proposes to talk about etiquette and about the orders of an Italian meal. In overlap with her turn, John positively assesses her proposal (*that’s good*, line 4) and Mary starts writing something on her notebook (possibly the title of her presentation or a reminder of the content she will have to cover). John subsequently reconfirms his assessment of Mary’s proposal with *oh yeah* (line 7) and suggests that Mary talks about etiquette first (line 7), and then about the various courses of an Italian meal. He then demonstratively illustrates the validity of his suggestion by using HD: *here is how you should eat, (0.2) and then you eat* (lines 8-9). With this script line, John animates (Goffman, 1981) what Mary might say during her presentation. In this case, the script line does not represent the final product, but rather a possible formulation of the script that is used for local interactional purposes, in order to support and give evidentiality to John’s proposal. Indeed, at this early stage of their planning, the participants do not orient to the relevance of translation. Instead, after Mary’s and Lucy’s assent (lines 11-12), John pursues further agreement (*right?*, line 13) and manifests his concern that his proposal actually makes sense (line 15). The ultimate outcome of this planning sequence is not a script line in Italian, but the reaching of shared agreement (lines 16-17) on the order of presentation of Mary’s topics.
In sum, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 5.11 and 5.12 has shown how script lines may emerge in English to propose what might be said and done during the presentation. Depending on the planning stage that the participants have reached, they may or may not orient to the relevance of an immediate translation into Italian. More specifically, in the earlier stages of the students’ planning work, when they are mainly engaged in negotiating a variety of possible courses of action for their presentation, English may be used to formulate script lines that support the speaker’s local interactional purposes, to make new proposals more tangible and perhaps more cogent.

5.6.4.2 Resorting to the L1 upon encountering trouble in the L2

This subsection explores how the participants, upon encountering trouble during the delivery of a line of their presentation in Italian, resort to English to provide a temporary formulation that will later be translated into Italian. Two different practices may be enacted. In the first practice (illustrated in Figures 5.13 and 5.14), the trouble source is represented by one specific lexical item, which the students temporarily convey in English as they incorporate it in the line-so-far. In the second practice (illustrated in Figure 5.15), one of the participants produces a script line in Italian and finds trouble with its projected continuation, which is then delivered in English. In both cases the participants orient to the temporariness of the expression conveyed in English by immediately translating it into Italian. That is, given the main interactional order that uses the L1 for the process and the L2 for the product, English is employed as language of the product only in transient formulations of the emergent artifacts.
The fragments in Figures 5.13 and 5.14 show how two students, in the midst of producing a line\(^{95}\) of their presentation in Italian, encounter trouble with the L2 and resort to English to deliver the next due item. That is, the same line is formulated in Italian and temporarily completed in English. The insertion of an English expression in this sequential position then engenders a collaborative search. This practice is illustrated with two excerpts from group D’s third planning session, when the participants are engaged in a run-through of their presentation.

Figure 5.13 partially reproduces Marta’s run-through. As she rehearses for her presentation, Marta is holding her note cards in her hands, but she does not look at them. Even if she did, the note cards contain a rather schematic summary of what she is going to say. In other words, Marta has not prepared a detailed script that she can read or memorize and, during her run-through, she produces an impromptu speech.

FIGURE 5.13 – UN VA- UN VARIE- VARIETY (Group D, Session 3)

1  MARTA: *ho un semestre con*  
   (i) have a semester with

2  [((1.2))]

3  [((David shows Roberta something on his screen))]

4  MARTA: *un [ corso] so:::* 
   a [course] se:::

5  DAVID:  [ hhh] (exhales)

6  [((1.2)]

7  [[[David shows Marta something on his screen])]

8  DAVID?  hh[hh] (exhales)

9  MARTA:  *[di matematica:::, [un corso di storia:::, ]] =  
   [of] ma:::th, [a course of history::,] =

10 DAVID:  *[°( )°]=

11 MARTA:  =un cor[so]=  
   =a cour[se]=

12 DAVID:  [hh] (exhales)

---

\(^{95}\) I use the word *line* and not the expression *script line* here, since none of the participants in these fragments uses a script when rehearsing the presentation.
FIGURE 5.13 (cont.)

13  (0.8)

14 MARTA: =di: #u:h# inglese, un corso di italiano,  
=o:f  english, a course of italian,

15  (.4) "u:h" (1.4) un v/ɛ/:::- (0.2) v/ɛ/rie, >variety¿<  
a v/ɛ/:::- v/ɛ/rious,

16  (0.2)

17 DAVID: mtch- varie,  
 various,

18 MARTA: [ varie?]  
[ various?]

19 LUCIO: [ varietà]:,  
[ variety]:,

20  (0.4)

21 MARTA: var/are/tà,  
variety,

22  (0.5)

23

24 LUCIO: [°right?]  
[(turns to Roberta)]

25  [{0.3}

26  {{(Roberta starts nodding)}}

28 MARTA: u[::n ] [var/are/tà.]  
a[:::-M ] [variety-F. ]  
a[::: ] [variety. ]

29 DAVID: [i thi]nk i[t’s varie. ]  
[ various.]

30  (0.2)

31 DAVID: °°va[rie°° ]  
°°va[rious°°]

32 ROBERTA: ["that’s] various:::.°

33 DAVID: uhm (0.2) ah.

34  (0.3)

35 MARTA: (an) var/are/età di corsi ma (0.7) in italia no:n (0.4)  
variety of courses but in italy no:t  
variety of courses but in italy

36 esiste un programma di studio generale.  
(it)exists a program of study general.  
a general course of study doesn’t exist.

The transcript picks up as Marta is describing the differences between the US and the Italian college systems. In the US there are general education classes, whereas in
Italy one’s course of study is specialized from the beginning. To illustrate these differences, Marta talks about the classes in which she is currently enrolled, in order to show the variety of courses that a student could take at an American university. She thus lists the courses she is taking: a math class (lines 4 and 9), a history class (line 9), an English class (lines 11 and 14) and an Italian class (line 14). The upshot of her list is that she is taking a variety of courses, whereas in Italy a general course of study for all the students does not exist (lines 34-35). In conveying the upshot of her reasoning, Marta encounters trouble with the Italian equivalent of variety. The pauses, the hesitation token “uh”, the cut-off un v/e/ː- (“a va”) in line 15 all display a forward-oriented self-initiation of repair, where the trouble is represented by the “relevant unavailability” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, p. 55) of the next due item. Marta then produces v/e/rie (possibly for varie, “various”, or as a partial version of varietà, “variety”, but there does not seem to be an actual cut-off after the delivery of the second syllable) and quickly offers the next due item in English with rising intonation >variety< (line 15).

Unfortunately, Marta is at an angle on the camera display and, in this specific moment of the interaction, she is behind David, so it is not possible to provide a description of her nonverbal behavior (especially in terms of eye gaze and head movements). It is clear, though, that she is engaged in a search and the intonation pattern in the delivery of variety displays that she is asking for her coparticipants’ collaboration. David and Lucio promptly come in and offer different candidate solutions: David offers varie (line 17), while Lucio offers varietà (line 19). Marta repeats both alternatives (lines 18 and 21),

---

96 Marta’s pronunciation is inaccurate. Here (line 15) she pronounces v/e/ instead of v/a/ for Italian varietà. In the following lines (21, 27, and 34), she pronounces var/a/ːtә instead of var/jәːtә (i.e., Marta’s rendition of the diphthong is anglicized: see English var/әːtә). However, neither Marta nor her coparticipants orient to these incorrect pronunciations as an issue.
while the other coparticipants – Andy and Roberta – do not show any uptake (see the pauses in lines 20 and 22). Lucio then engages Roberta by turning to her (line 24) and saying “right?” (line 23) with upward intonation. Roberta starts nodding (line 26) and Marta displays acceptance of Lucio’s solution by saying $\text{un} \text{ var/aiə/ətə}$ (“a variety”, line 27). David however resists Marta’s action and initiates repair on varietà by restating, albeit tentatively, the accuracy of the lexical item he proposed ($i$ $think$ it’s varie, line 28). Finally, Roberta clarifies that varie means “various” (line 31); David hesitates ($uhm$, line 32), but eventually claims an epistemic change of state ($ah$, line 32); and Marta inserts Italian varietà in the complete formulation of the line (((an) var/aiə/etə di corsi ma (0.7) in italia no:n (0.4) esiste un programma di studio generale, “(a) variety of courses, but in Italy a general course of study doesn’t exist”, lines 34-35).

The fragment in Figure 5.14 picks up as Lucio is rehearsing his presentation on the Italian school system. He is the only student who does not create a script for his presentation; the only artifact he creates for himself is a list of the types of school he is going to mention. Note that Lucio is an advanced heritage speaker of Italian: his mother is Italian and he has frequent contacts with Italian friends, both online and in person, whenever he goes to Italy.

**FIGURE 5.14 – CI SONO QUELLI PIÙ THE MOST COMMON (Group D, Session 3)**

1 LUCIO: \textit{dopo le medie:::} (1.3) \textit{si:::} \textit{si va al after the middle::: (school) one::: one goes to-the after middle::: (school) one::: one goes to liceo. \textit{si deve d/i/c/e/dere::} (0.5) \textit{che tipo di high school. one has-to decide:: what kind of}

\[97\] The phrase \textit{un varietà} presents inaccurate gender agreement: \textit{un} is the masculine form of the indefinite article, \textit{varietà} is a feminine noun. The participants, however, do not orient to this as an issue.
FIGURE 5.14 (cont.)

3 liceo vuoi fare, tipo: ci sono: (0.7)
   high school (you-SG) want to do, like: there: are:
   high school (you) want to do, like: there: are:

4 quelli più: [the: the most common?
   those most: [ [((turns to Roberta))

6 [(0.2)
7 [((mutual eye gaze between Lucio and Roberta established))

8 LUCIO: °>how do you say that¿<°

9 ROBERTA: °( [° ] )°]
10 MARTA: [ ]
11 DAVID: [più comune,]
   [more common,]
12 ANDY: [più °com-° co]modo?
   [more °com-° co]mfortable?

13 (0.2)

14 LUCIO: [((gazes at Roberta first, then at David))
15 °i più:
   °the-PL mo[:st°
   °the mo[:st°
16 ANDY: [((il) più co]modo? ]
   [(the-SG) most co[mfortable?]
   [(the) most co[mfortable?]
17 DAVID: [°cumu-° ]
   [°commo-° ]

18 (0.2)
19 DAVID: [cumune.]
   [common.]
20 ROBERTA: [cumune.]
   [common.]

21 (0.3)
22 LUCIO: yeah.=oh. comu[ne. ]
   comm[on. ]
23 ANDY: °o:h.] what’s ° oh. [>comfortable.<]=
24 ROBERTA: [>comfortable.<]
25 ANDY: =ha [hahahaha most comfortable too. ]
26 LUCIO: [e::: ( ) più comuni ]=
   [a:::nd most common ]=
27 =sono il liceo classico,
   =are the high school classical,
   =are the classical high school,
In lines 1-2 Lucio describes how Italian students, once completing middle school, go to high school and have to decide which type of high school they want to attend. He then orient to listing the most common high schools in Italy (lines 3-4). However, he encounters trouble with the Italian equivalent of common and thus delivers this item in English. His turn looks as follows: *ci sono quelli più: the: the most common?* ("there are those most the the most common", lines 3-4). Italian and English are therefore used in the same turn and English marks a problematic item. In terms of Lucio’s nonverbal behavior, he looks at his computer screen (possibly at the relevant slide in his power point) during the delivery of his turn in Italian, but turns to one of the coparticipants, Roberta, as soon as he starts conveying the English expression (lines 4-5). With his bodily posture and the upward intonation in *the: the most common?*, Lucio is involving Roberta in his search for the relevant item. Lucio and Roberta then establish mutual eye gaze (line 7), but Roberta does not respond right away (line 6). Lucio then packages the word search in a question format with *how do you say that?* (line 8); during the delivery of this turn, his eye gaze is mainly directed at Roberta, but he subsequently shifts and looks in Marta’s and David’s direction as well. At this point, two competing solutions are offered: David offers *più comune*, ("most common", line 11), Andy *più comodo?* ("most comfortable", line 12). In line 14 Lucio’s eye gaze shows how he orients to Roberta and David as his actual interlocutors, while he turns his back to Andy. As Lucio says *i più:" ("the most”, line 15), Andy reissues his proposal with *comodo* ("comfortable", line 16), while David and Roberta agree on *comune* as the equivalent of *common* (lines 19-20). Lucio finally accepts their solution with *yeah* and a

---

98 I am translating liceo as “high school” since Lucio seems to be using this word as the superordinate term. As a matter of fact, liceo is a specific category of scuola superiore ("high school").
change of state token (oh), and repeats the Italian word they suggested with downward intonation (comune, “common”, line 22). It is only at this point that Andy finally realizes the inaccuracy of the solution he proposed (what’s co- oh. >comfortable<, line 23), laughs and makes a joke about the use of that term to talk about schools in Italy (line 25). Lastly, in lines 26-27, Lucio incorporates the relevant Italian item (comune) in his list of the most common high schools in Italy (e::: ( ) più comuni sono il liceo classico, “and () most common are the classical high school”). Note that Lucio accurately produces the number agreement of the adjective comuni with quelli (“those”, line 3), referring to different types of liceo.

In summary, the analysis of the fragments reproduced in Figures 5.13 and 5.14 has shown how participants who are rehearsing their presentation may encounter trouble with an L2 item and thus insert its equivalent in English in the turn they are producing. The use of English and the intonational pattern (specifically, rising intonation) in the delivery of the problematic item, possibly accompanied by a shift in eye gaze to the coparticipants (as in Figure 5.14) engender a collaborative search, during which alternative solutions are proposed. Clearly, then, the contrast created by the language alternation between Italian and English in the same turn and the deviant use of English as language of the product convey a sense of temporariness, to which the participants immediately orient by providing possible translations for the English expression. To put it another way, this is a case of interactional otherness (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002) that is oriented to as needing repair; in Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) terms, this is a case of medium repair (and not an actual codeswitch).
The fragment in Figure 5.15 (which partially reproduces Figure 5.6 above) illustrates a different practice, enacted by a student in group A, during the second planning session. The students here are still engaged in the ideational phase of planning, during which they elaborate possible formulations of script lines to include in their final written artifact. In doing so, they may start producing a script line in Italian, then project a continuation, and at that point encounter trouble in formulating it in Italian. English then lends itself as a semiotic resource that allows the students to express the following part of the plan, which will then be translated into Italian.

**FIGURE 5.15 – TODAY WE HAVE** (Group A, Session 2)

1. MARY: >and you could be like< \(\text{O} \uparrow \text{KA::y. oggi cominciamo co::n,= today (we)begin wi::th,=}
2. LUCY: =[yeah.
3. ((Mary turns and looks down at her notebook))
4. (.)
5. LUCY: =[cool.]
6. MARY: [aper]itivo:, [aper]itif:,
7. ((leans forward, hands on notebook))
8. ((0.6)
9. ((Mary lifts eye gaze and looks at the screen))
10. MARY: u:hm >and you could be like< today we have.=
11. =like oggi::, u::hm (0.4) tch- (0.6) \(\text{w-w-} \) abbiamo::, (we)have::,
12. (0.6)
13. MARY: you know.
14. (0.4)
15. MARY: °what have you.°

After producing a script line in Italian (\(\text{O} \uparrow \text{KA::y. oggi cominciamo co::n, ... aperitivo:;}

“Okay. Today we begin with aperitif”, lines 1 and 6), Mary orients to her notebook as the focus of her next actions: as soon as Lucy agrees (line 2) with the line that Mary is producing (line 1), Mary turns her body and eye gaze toward her notebook (line 3); then,
during the delivery of the last part of the line (*aperitivo*, line 6), Mary leans forward and places her hands on the notebook (line 7). All these nonverbal behaviors are a clear indication of Mary’s projected engagement with the action of writing the script line in her notebook. However, the slightly rising intonation on *aperitivo* (“aperitif”) in line 6 suggests that more is yet to come and Mary soon disengages from the projected action of writing to produce a continuation of the script line proposed so far. She encounters trouble, though, as indicated by the 0.6 second pause in line 8, by the hesitation token *u:hm* (line 10), and by the fact that she lifts her eye gaze from the notebook and looks ahead, in the direction of her computer screen (line 9): at this point, Mary is engaged neither with her coparticipants, nor with her notebook, but is involved in a private, self-directed search. The solution is delivered in English, which – in Mary’s turn in line 10 – expresses not only the process (with the quotative frame >*and you could be like*<) but the product as well (with the continuation of the script line in English: *today we have*). The temporary suspension of the normative interactional order that assigns English to the process and Italian to the product is accountable, as indicated by Mary’s immediate orientation to a translation of the line-so-far into Italian (line 11).

In conclusion, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15 has illustrated different practices, which are nonetheless united by the use of English as a resource in the face of trouble with the L2. Whether the participants encounter trouble with specific lexical items (as in Figures 5.13 and 5.14) or with the formulation of an entire script line (as in Figure 5.15), English can function as a temporary language of the product by conveying problematic items/expressions that will be either individually or collaboratively translated into Italian.
5.6.4.3 Resorting to the L1 in final (focus) position

This subsection explores how English is used as the language of the product in sentence final position. The temporariness of this version of the artifact is marked by the use of the L1 itself, and by the indeterminateness of the English expressions.

Figure 5.16 partially reproduces Figure 5.6 above. But let us first see what happened before this stretch of talk. In interaction not exhibited here, the participants were looking online for some information on the structure of an Italian meal. After finding a relevant website, Mary read a list of the main courses from that webpage. Right after reading this list, Mary copied the names of the courses in her notebook and the participants started to assign each course to a different student-presenter. Figure 5.6 above reproduces the moment when John and Mary designate Lucy as the presenter of the course *aperitivo*. The fragment in Figure 5.16 picks up when Mary starts producing the line that Lucy might say in introducing *aperitivo* as a course on the menu. That is, she might list the foods and the drinks that their imaginary restaurant carries for aperitif.

FIGURE 5.16 – WHAT HAVE YOU (Group A, Session 2)

1  MARY: u:hm >and you could be like< today we have.=
2  =like oggi::, u::hm (0.4) tch- (0.6) w-ºº abbia::o::, (we)have::,
3  [(0.6)
4  [((Mary looks at her computer screen))]
5  MARY: you know.
6  (0.4)
7  MARY: *what have you.*

The first part of this scriptline is formulated in English (*today we have*, line 1). After translating the line-so-far into Italian (*oggi::, ... abbia::o::*, line 2), Mary starts looking at
her computer screen (line 4) during the 0.6 second pause in line 3, and keeps her eye gaze there. With a codeswitch to English, she then produces you know (line 5), a placeholder invoking a claim of her coparticipants’ familiarity with what she is trying to say, and finally completes her turn with ºwhat have youº (line 7). Thus, the line-so-far unfolds as follows: oggi abbiamo ... what have you (“today we have … what have you”). Here what have you substitutes for the syntactically projected slot of the object of abbiamo (“we have”); i.e., the slot where Mary could list the drinks and the foods that constitute aperitivo.

The indeterminate English expression thus accomplishes the function of indicating that the script line is still in an incomplete stage. Quite interestingly though, what is missing is the most important part of the sentence. The English expression, in fact, occupies the slot of the focus which, in the information structure of the sentence, typically conveys new information.

Figure 5.17 reproduces the lines just prior to Figure 5.10 above.

FIGURE 5.17 – IL CIBI PIU TIPICHE SONO THESE (Group B, Session 2)
1 JENNY: i think, (1.0) maybe for (. ) my part of it, (0.4)
2 ’cause you are doing mostly the history, (0.4)
3 EMILY: *right.*=
4 JENNY: =i might talk about: (1.1) like spend a few:: (0.8)
5 sentences on (0.4) like common foods,
6 (or/where) like (0.7)

7 EMILY: [right.]
8 JENNY: [u::hm ] (0.3) °the crostoli[::, °]¹⁰¹
9 EMILY: [ wa]s it- (0.3) yeah. (. )

¹⁰⁰ I am indebted to Makoto Hayashi for this observation.
¹⁰¹ Crostoli are a kind of Carnival cookie.
At the beginning of the second planning session, the participants in group B discuss the topics for Jenny’s presentation. In lines 1-8 Jenny describes her plan: since Emily is talking about the history of Carnival as a tradition, Jenny will “spend a few sentences” on common Carnival foods, like the crostoli (i.e., a kind of cookie). In lines 9-12, then, Emily reminds herself and Jenny about the outline they created the day before (see Figure 4.20 in Chapter 4), with a list of possible topics like food, masks, and Carnival-related events. Jenny then engages in the production of a script line about typical Carnival foods. The complete version of the line is: il cibi:
(0.4) u:hm (0.8) mangiare più
the-M-SG foo::ds-M
the foo::ds

At the beginning of the second planning session, the participants in group B discuss the
and 20-22. In lines 14-16 Jenny’s eye gaze is directed either downwards or ahead, thereby signaling disengagement from her coparticipant. When Jenny says *più tipiche sono* (“most typical are”, line 18), though, she establishes mutual eye gaze with Emily who finally nods (line 19) as Jenny is delivering the verb form *sono*. A 0.7 second pause follows (line 20), during which Jenny turns to look ahead (line 21), in the direction of the computer screen; she keeps her eye gaze in that direction as she delivers the token “*uhm*” (line 22) and pauses again (line 22), before completing her turn with the English demonstrative *these* (line 22). As she is delivering *these*, Jenny moves the pen in her right hand above her notebook (line 23) in a gesture that suggests writing. In the meantime, Jenny turns to Emily (line 24), establishes mutual eye gaze with her, and describes the last part of the plan-so-far (*and then maybe like show a picture*, line 25); as she does so, Emily nods and smiles (line 26).

What the eye gaze patterns seem to suggest here is that: (a) by averting her eye gaze from Emily, Jenny characterizes moments of problematic delivery of the script line as private moments of difficulty (lines 14-16 and 20-22); (b) by looking at Emily once the trouble is over (lines 17-18 and 22-24), Jenny makes a response relevant from her. Note in fact that Emily nods (lines 19 and 26) and thus displays her acceptance of Jenny’s plan precisely when they are mutually gazing at each other.

Now, it is not clear from the video whether in lines 20-22 Jenny is looking at a distance ahead or at a specific spot on the computer screen where she might find a list of Carnival foods. What is certain, though, is that the copula *sono* (“are”, line 18) syntactically projects a slot for a noun, a pronoun, or an adjective. Since an Italian expression is not immediately produced (see the pauses and the token *uhm* in lines 20 and
22), Jenny resorts to English *these* to fill that slot. Again, as in Figure 5.16, this is the slot for the focus of the sentence; i.e., for what should be the most informative part of it. However, instead of providing new information, Jenny uses a deictic English expression. In and of itself, the expression is not necessarily indeterminate, but it acquires a sense of vagueness by the fact that it cannot be linked to any referent. Jenny’s gesture of moving the pen above the notebook suggests, in fact, that whatever *these* indexes, it has not been written yet. Finally, in this fragment the use of the L1 expression represents an actual codeswitch that embodies a language alternation within the same turn and a deviation from the local interactional order that prescribes English as the language of the process.

In conclusion, the analysis of the fragments in Figures 5.16 and 5.17 has shown how the participants, while formulating a script line in Italian, produce a turn that syntactically projects a slot for the focus of the sentence. However, ensuing pauses (lines 3 and 6 in Figure 5.16, lines 20 and 22 in Figure 5.17) signal that filling the new information slot is problematic. Note also how, during these silences, the participants seem to be looking in the direction of the computer screen, possibly to find there the relevant item to fill the projected slot. A temporary solution is found by resorting to an English expression of a rather indeterminate nature. The use of English as temporary language of the product in an environment where Italian is normatively utilized in that function, and the use of expressions that suggest vagueness display that the script-line-as-emergent-artifact is not complete and that the plan is still indefinite. These English expressions, then, have an important role in the planning process, in that they embody the temporaneity of the plan so far formulated.

\[102\] In these cases the participants may not be facing a linguistic problem with their L2, but may simply be having difficulty in coming up with the relevant information that constitutes the focus of the sentence.
5.6.5 Italian as a temporary language of the process

This section illustrates those instances where Italian is used in and for the planning process itself. Subsection 5.6.5.1 focuses on those fragments where the Italian token *sì* is used to express and finalize agreement on a suggested solution for the artifact being developed. Subsection 5.6.5.2 illustrates the only case in the whole data set where Italian is used to invite the coparticipant to solve a word search.

5.6.5.1 Italian *sì* at the end of agreement sequences

In fragments analyzed before (in the present chapter and in Chapter 4), we have seen how the participants who are engaged in collaborative work on a script line may convey their agreement to the version of the line-so-far with the Italian token *sì*. In this section I will first summarize the analysis of each fragment. Then, I will discuss the similarities among the fragments and what the use of Italian might additionally convey in these interactional environments.

The fragment in Figure 5.18 partially reproduces Figure 5.7 above.

FIGURE 5.18 – TIPI DI RISTORANTI? SÌ (Group A, Session 2)

1  JOHN: i’m talking about the: (0.7) [u:h ]
2  LUCY: [types] of-
3  JOHN: *types of restaurants*.
4  LUCY: [yeah. ]
5  MARY: [o::h! ]sorry. (. ) no wonder.
6  (0.7)
7  MARY: [((looks at the script))]
8  [il ristoranti italo americano:,
 [italian american restaurants,
9  (0.2)
10  MARY: u:hm
11  (0.2)
12  LUCY: i *tipi*,
     the types;,
In line 3 John announces that he will talk about types of (Italian) restaurants. Lucy and Mary then engage in a collaborative translation of this expression (lines 12-13). In line 13 Mary delivers the final version of the translation with rising intonation (tipi di ristoranti?, “types of restaurants”). Lucy agrees with sì (“yes”, line 14). Mary then starts writing in her notebook (line 16).

The fragment in Figure 5.19 partially reproduces Figure 4.12.2 in Chapter 4.

FIGURE 5.19 – ARRIVATE. SÌ (Group A, Session 3)
1  JOHN: (((writing))
2    [right¿(.)°va a parlare di:° (0.9)
3    [°is going to talk about:
4
5  MARY: arriv-
6
8  JOHN: (((writing))
9    [arrivano.
10   [(they)arrive.
11
12  MARY: =o:r u:hm (0.2) wouldn’t it be< you ▲guys then,
13  JOHN: [ M]PH (0.2) you’re right.
15  JOHN: [ arrivare.
16   [(you]-PL)arrive.
16   [yo]u arrive.
Here the participants are collaboratively working on a transitioning line from John’s presentation to Mary’s presentation. In its final version, the script line will look as follows: (Mary) *va a parlare di cosa fate quando arrivate* (“Mary is going to talk about what you do when you get there”).

The first *si* is issued after a complex repair sequence on the verb form. When the final solution is worked out (*arrivate*, “you arrive”, line 15) by John, Mary – who has actively participated in the repair work – expresses her agreement with *si* (line 17). On the other hand, Lucy – who has been a rather marginal participant in this exchange –
displays her agreement with simple head nods (line 19). John then repeats the form they have just agreed on (line 21) as he engages in the action of writing (line 20).

In line 23 John repeats part of the line-so-far with *cosa fate quando* (“what you do when”); he then resumes the action of writing and delivers the last part of the line with "*quando:**: (0.5) "*arrivato." (“when you arrive”, lines 25-26). After a 0.2 second silence (line 27), John announces that he “got it” (line 28) and Mary seals the final agreement with a *sì* (“yes”, line 30) that marks the end of the participants’ work on this line.

The fragment in Figure 5.20 partially reproduces Figure 4.18 in Chapter 4.

*FIGURE 5.20 – OGGI LE SPECIALITÀ, Sì (Group A, Session 2)*

1    LUCY: well= u- i: >’s thinking like we were getting to say like
         our< topics. (0.8)

4    JOHN: o:h= o[k.]

5    LUCY: [li]ke ou- >our specials< today are.

6    and then like [(0.7) °°(you sa-)°°

7    [[(looks and points at John)]

8    you::[: say you]r- (. ) like you [say your topic]=

9    MARY: [mh mh. °mh mh." °°yeah." °°] [(°°yeah.°° )]

10   LUCY: =and then like i say my: topic and then like

11   you [say your topic. ]

12   MARY: [(°° °°)]

13   (0.5)

14   JOHN: s[ure.]

15   MARY: [so:.]

16   oggi le [specialità,

17   today the [specials,

18   [((bends over notebook, moves pen to notebook))

19   [(0.7)

19   [((Mary writes)]

20   LUCY: °si.°

21   °yes.°

22   [(0.8)

22   [((Mary writes)]
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The participants are here collaboratively creating the line that introduces the topics of their individual presentations as the specials of the day (lines 1-5). The line emerges in English as >our specials< today are (line 5). Lucy then describes her plan: after the delivery of that introductory script line, each participant will mention his/her topic. Once Lucy’s plan is clear and meets with the coparticipants’ agreement (Mary in line 9, John in line 14), Mary translates the line into Italian with oggi le specialità (“today the specials”, line 16) and starts writing (lines 17-19). At this point, Lucy finalizes the agreement with a soft sì (“yes”, line 20) and Mary keeps writing (line 22).

The fragment in Figure 5.21 partially reproduces Figure 4.25.2 in Chapter 4.

FIGURE 5.21 – LA CELEBRAZIONE? SÌ (Group B, Session 2)

1 EMILY: maybe say: per:: (1.0) la /s/elebrazione? for:: the-F-SG celebration-F?
   the celebration?

2 (.)
3 EMILY: ’cause we started the sentence like with (0.7)
4 °the carnival."°
5 (0.2)
6 EMILY: °you know?°
7 (1.3)
8 JENNY: that’s a good one.
9 (0.6)
10 EMILY: °bra (0.5) <sio:ne>°
11 (1.8)
12 EMILY: OKAY.

13 [((Jenny starts writing))]
14 [((then turns head to Emily))]
15
16 JENNY: il-the-M-SG- (0.5) la: the-F-SG celebration-F?
   the: celebration?

17 [(0.6)
18 [((Jenny starts erasing))]

19 EMILY: s::i:::
     ye::s:::

20 (0.2)
21 JENNY: okay.
In this complex fragment, Emily orients to a problem in lexical variation and suggests that they replace the expression *il carnevale* (“the carnival”) with *la celebrazione* (“the celebration”), since they have used *il carnevale* at the beginning of the script (lines 1-4). Jenny accepts Emily’s suggested correction of the script with a positive assessment (*that’s a good one*, line 8) and she starts writing (line 14). As previously discussed (see section 4.4.4), after leaning on Emily’s notebook to see what she has written, Jenny repairs *il* (“the”), the masculine form of the definite article with feminine *la* (“the”), which is indeed the right form of the article for the noun *celebrazione* (“celebration”, line 16). Right after the delivery of *la: /s/celebrazione?* (“the celebration”, line 16), with rising intonation, Jenny starts erasing what she wrote (line 18) and Emily finally confirms, with an emphatic *s::ì::* (“yes”, line 19), the accuracy of Jenny’s repair. Jenny reconfirms with *okay* (line 21) and writes (line 23).

Now, what do these four fragments have in common? First of all, they seem to mark the end of rather complex sequences of collaborative work on artifacts and they all tend to occur at a moment in the interaction when the action of writing is relevant. Agreement is finally reached (or is about to be reached) and the participants start writing the agreed upon solution in their scripts. Moreover, except for the second *sì* in Figure 5.19 (line 29), in all these instances the Italian agreement token occurs right after an Italian form, which is proposed as a possible final version of the script line. In other words, the participants agree in Italian to an Italian form.

As mentioned above, the *sì* in Figure 5.19, line 29, is different in that it represents an actual codeswitch from John’s *got it* in his prior turn (line 27). In this case, in fact,
there is language alternation and, in addition, the use of Italian as language of the process contrasts with the local interactional order of English being used for planning talk. This contrast, however, is not oriented to as needing repair. It is simply a case of temporary suspension from current medium (*medium suspension*; see Gafaranga & Torras, 2002) that is functional to the interaction since it allows the speaker to emphasize the strength of the agreement.

What about the other instances of *sì* then? Strictly speaking, they are not codeswitches, in that there is no language alternation with respect to the prior turn, conveyed in Italian. However, they too can be seen as deviations from the overall interactional order. In fact, they deviate from the normatively established function of Italian as language of the product, in that – with the token *sì* – Italian is used for the process, to express agreement on a proposed final version of the product.

What I am arguing, then, is that the use of Italian *sì* – by virtue of its deviant function as language of the process – appears to add emphasis to the agreement. Furthermore, by occurring at the end of complex sequences of collaborative work, this usage of Italian seems to mark the sequential boundary between an action that is coming to an end and a new course of action.

### 5.6.5.2 Using Italian to other-direct a word search

Another example of Italian used as language of the process is illustrated in Figure 5.22, which partially reproduces Figure 5.10 above.

**FIGURE 5.22 – HOW DO YOU SAY COMMON? (Group B, Session 2)**

1  JENNY: yeah. and also like (1.0) [è::::::::: (0.5) [(it)i:::::::::s
2                       [((looks down))]
3                             [I don’t know how to say
4                               [((looks ahead))
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FIGURE 5.22 (cont.)

5 [{common.
6 [{(turns to Emily)}]

7 [{(0.3)
8 [{(mutual eye gaze maintained)}]

9 JENNY: [{come si dice common?]
[how one says
[how do you say
10 [{(Emily averts eye gaze and looks up)}]

11 (0.8)
12 JENNY: tipiche?
typical-F-PL?
typical?

13 (0.3)
14 EMILY: °°com-°°=[ tipi [che.
[ Tipi ][cal-F-PL.
[ Tipi ][cal.
15 [{(nods)}][{(turns to Jenny)}]

The transcript picks up as Jenny is starting to formulate the script line that, in its final version, will be as follows: e è tipiche per il festivali avere puppet shows (“and it is typical for the festival to have puppet shows”). As illustrated in the analysis of Figure 5.10, Jenny encounters trouble in mid turn, right after the delivery of the copula è::: ("is", line 1). She thus engages in a private search, then openly declares that she does not know how to say common (lines 3-6). Jenny’s verbalization of her trouble with this specific lexical item is transformed into a request for help by Jenny’s eye gaze: as she says common (line 5), she turns to look at Emily (line 6). Mutual eye gaze is established (line 8), but Emily does not provide a response (see the the pause in line 7). At this point, Jenny explicitly issues her request for help by other-directing her search at Emily with the question come si dice common? (“how do you say common”, line 9). Once her response has been made verbally relevant, Emily averts her eye gaze and looks up (line 10). This action displays that Emily makes Jenny’s search her own. However, she does not provide any answer. When Jenny proposes tipiche (“typical”, line 12) as a possible translation for
Emily keeps looking up and being silent (line 13). Finally, she produces a cut-off *com-* (which could be either the beginning of English *common* or of Italian *comune*, “common”) and repeats, with downward intonation, the solution that Jenny has just proposed (*tipiche*, line 14). In doing so, Emily smiles, nods and finally turns to Jenny (line 15), who will then incorporate the word *tipiche* in the final version of the script line.

Jenny’s turn in line 9 is a codeswitch: there is language alternation with respect to the prior turn and the use of Italian for planning talk deviates from the local interactional order of Italian being the language normatively used for the product. I contend that this use of Italian might make the other-directed search more salient, despite the fact that the participant uses a formula that is commonly taught since the very first semester. After all, the fact that this formula appears here and only here in the entire dataset is rather meaningful in and of itself.

### 5.7 Practices revealing the interplay between the L1 and the L2

A close investigation of how the students work on emergent artifacts shows various practices that reveal how the students orient to the interplay between the L1 and the L2. The present section is thus devoted to an illustration of these practices, in order to gain insights about the students’ orientation to the two languages and about their interpretation of the final task. Such practices include: (a) collaborative work on alternative English formulations (subsection 5.7.1); (b) (re)translation\(^\text{103}\) into the L1 to verify the morpho-

---

\(^{103}\) In some cases the participants are engaged in an actual retranslation; i.e., as they work on a script line, they translate an expression from English into Italian and then back, from Italian into English. In other cases, though, it is not clear that they have actually enacted a translation from English into Italian in the first place; under such circumstance, then, it is safer to talk about a simple *translation into the L1*. What both these practices (i.e., retranslation and translation into the L1) have in common is the way the participants orient to their L1 as a disambiguating resource that can ensure mutual understanding and that can help them to verify the accuracy of
syntactic accuracy of L2 expressions (subsection 5.7.2) and the lexical accuracy of an L2 item (subsection 5.7.3); (c) translation into the L1 as a tool for doing remembering (subsection 5.7.4).

5.7.1 Easy English for easy Italian

This subsection illustrates the practices that the participants in group A enacted when engaged in definition talk about the courses of an Italian meal during their second planning session. These practices reveal the participants’ orientation to collaboratively creating simple definitions in English that can be easily translated into Italian and easily understood by their classmates.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.23 is part of a longer sequence where the participants try to elaborate an appropriate definition for *aperitivo* (“aperitif”) with the help of a website. The interaction shows how the students deem the definition provided by the website as too difficult to translate into Italian and how they reformulate it in English several times.

**FIGURE 5.23 – IT’S AN EASY THING TO SAY** (Group A, Session 2)

1 LUCY: [((looking at the screen))]
2 [used to (.) stimulate the=
3 =*[appetite. °°(It says here.)°° ]*
4 JOHN: [s:::(h) to(h) s(h)ti)m(h)ulate the appetite
5 before a meal. (.) awesome.
6 (0.7)

7 MARY: [((smiles))]
8 [nh) h::u
9 (3.5)
10 LUCY: [ ] aperiti:fs?]
11 JOHN: ["sure." (0.2) to open yo]ur=U:h (.) palate.
12 (0.4)

their L2 linguistic artifacts. For these reasons, I subsume these practices under the label *(re)translation.*
FIGURE 5.23 (cont.)

13  JOHN: right?
14    (0.4)
15  MARY: "right."
16    (0.5)
17  JOHN: to let. verb. (.) to open.
18    (1.5)
19  MARY: there you go.
20    (0.9)
21  LUCY: "yeah."
22    (0.3)
23  JOHN: cool.
24    (0.4)
25  MARY: [((looking at her notes))
26    [okay. so. cominciamo con aperitivo. aperitivo è una
27      let's begin with aperitif. aperitif is an
28    [bevanda alcolizzata: [ta:, [alcoholic drank:nk:
29      [((turns to Lucy))
30    (0.3)
31  LUCY: u:::hm=
32  MARY: =per:xr,=
33    =to;,,=
34  LUCY: =per (0.3) u:::hm
35    =to
36    (2.3)
37  LUCY: [((looking at John))
38    [do i look stimulate up?
39    (0.2)
40  LUCY: [or do (we) wanna say open.
41  MARY: "mh."
42  JOHN: open. let's go with (the) open.
43  LUCY: okay.
44  JOHN: =it's (an) easy.
45    (0.7)
46  MARY: [((looking at Lucy))
47    [per aver ] [to have ]
48  JOHN: [thing to ] s[ :a :]:y.
49  LUCY: [ap- ]
50    [op- ]
51  MARY: ["per"
52    [to"
53    (.)
In lines 1-5, Lucy and John report part of the definition from the website they are consulting, which says that an aperitif is “used to stimulate the appetite before a meal”.\textsuperscript{104} John’s stance toward the definition is revealed by the laughter interspersing his turn: he appears amused by this characterization of aperitif. Mary affiliates with John’s stance, by smiling (line 7) and producing a laughter token (line 8). In line 11 John offers an alternative formulation of the function of aperitivo: it is used to open your palate.\textsuperscript{105} Both Mary (lines 15 and 19) and Lucy (line 21) display their assent,\textsuperscript{106} while John positively assesses the reached agreement with cool (line 23).

In lines 25-27 Mary repeats the script-line-so-far: cominciamo con aperitivo. aperitivo è una bevanda alcolizzata: (“Let’s begin with aperitif. Aperitif is an alcoholic

\textsuperscript{104} The participants most likely used Wikipedia, which they explicitly indicated as one of the sources for their presentation. The Wikipedia page on aperitif says: “usually served before a meal to stimulate the appetite”.

\textsuperscript{105} The etymological note on Wikipedia specifies that aperitif derives from Latin aperire (“to open”). This might be the source of John’s formulation.

\textsuperscript{106} John’s action in line 17 is not clear. He seems to reconfirm and re-settle on to open as the appropriate lexical item to use.
drink”). She then turns to Lucy (line 28), the designated presenter of aperitivo, possibly soliciting her to add a continuation to the script line. Lucy takes the floor, but displays uncertainty (u:::::hm, line 30). Mary latches onto Lucy’s turn with the preposition pe:r (“to”, line 31), which projects an infinitive form expressing the function of aperitivo. Lucy immediately recycles this preposition (line 32), but once again displays uncertainty (see the 0.3 second pause and the token u:::::hm). After a 2.3 second pause (line 33), the source of Lucy’s uncertainty becomes evident as she turns to look at John (line 34) and, despite their prior agreement on to open your palate (versus to stimulate the appetite), reopens the issue by asking John whether she should look for the Italian equivalent of stimulate or of open (lines 35-37). John confirms the alternative he proposed (line 39) and provides an account for it: he chose open, because it’s (an) easy ... thing to say (lines 41 and 45). These lines (34-45) show that the website may well be a reliable source of information, endowed – for that matter – with higher epistemic authority. But when it comes to the wording for their presentation, it is the students’ right to decide whether an expression is easy enough to be translated and used in the script.

Once Lucy expresses agreement (line 40), Mary and Lucy try to translate open in Italian without looking at a dictionary. After a number of tries (i.e., per aver, “to have”, line 44; ap-, lines 46, 50, 52, 54; a:pri:::; line 49), Mary finally comes up with the accurate translation aprire (line 55), which gets accepted by Lucy (line 57). In the following lines (see Figure 5.25 below), Lucy produces a continuation with aprire la

---

107 In Italian, alcolizzata can only be used for a person who suffers from alcoholism. The students, however, unproblematically use alcolizzata as meaning “containing alcohol”.

108 Note that to stimulate the appetite would be easy to translate into Italian: stimulate is cognate with Italian stimolare, and appetite is cognate with Italian appetito. John’s account (lines 41 and 45) shows that he does not know (or does not orient to) this similarity between the two languages.
**sapore** (“to open the taste”).\(^{109}\) This, however, triggers Mary’s ultimate rejection, as shown in Figure 5.24 below.

**FIGURE 5.24 – SO EVERYONE WILL UNDERSTAND (Group A, Session 2)**

83 MARY: [no::.
84 ((shakes head, turns head to screen))
85 (0.2)
86 MARY: *i feel like this is not going to be the* right (.) translation.
87 ((Mary types, all participants looking at the screen))
88 [{(3.3)}
89 ((Mary types, all participants looking at the screen))
90 MARY: what’s another way of saying that too so
91 >everyone< will understand?=
92 JOHN: =>to get you ready to< eat.
93 (0.2)
94 MARY: yea:h.

Mary in fact says: *i feel like this is not going to be the* right (.) translation (lines 86-87). With her turn, Mary explicitly characterizes their effort so far as translation work and displays her orientation to lexical accuracy. To this end, they might find help in an online dictionary. Indeed, this is the course of action taken on by Mary, who turns to the computer screen (line 84) and starts typing (line 89). She then reveals her concern: they have to keep in mind their audience and formulate a definition that *everyone* will understand (line 91). That is, Mary, John and Lucy orient to the comprehensibility of their definition. Note that comprehensibility is also one of the teachers’ grading criteria for classroom presentations. Here the students orient to it, even though the presentation they are presently working on will not be graded (see Chapter 3, section 3.2). Anyway, before they find a valid alternative on the dictionary, John provides a new candidate formulation: *to get you ready to* eat (line 92), which is accepted by Mary (line 94). In the remaining part of the sequence, the students will attempt to translate this expression

---

\(^{109}\) The noun phrase *la sapore* displays a gender agreement problem (*la* is feminine, *sapore* is masculine). However, the participants do not orient to it.
and, upon finding the translation problematic, they will propose yet other formulations in English, until they will finally settle on *to begin the dinner*, an expression accepted for its easiness.

In summary, Figures 5.23 and 5.24 have shown how the participants first consult English-written websites to find relevant information for their presentation. The students then engage in collaborative work to determine whether the English expressions found online are easy enough to be translated into an Italian equivalent that is easy to say and to understand. This practice reveals an important aspect in the students’ conceptualization of the interplay between the two languages: easy English expressions correspond to easy Italian expressions.

### 5.7.2 (Re)translation into English to verify the accuracy of L2 morphosyntax

Another aspect of the interplay between the L1 and the L2 emerges from the practice of (re)translation into the L1. In this subsection I explore how the participants, in their orientation to accuracy, translate an Italian expression into English to verify its morphosyntactic accuracy.

The fragment in Figure 5.25 exhibits the lines following Figure 5.23, once Mary and Lucy had agreed on *per aprire* as correctly translating *to open*.

**FIGURE 5.25 – WE USE THE INFINITIVE. YEAH. (Group A, Session 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>LUCY: [{but-} ] is it- (. ) would that be ri:ght.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>JOHN: [º(sure.)º]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>LUCY: grammatically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>JOHN: °(bu-) ° (. ) [ºper (i think)º]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ºto. °]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>MARY: [ºfor to open, °]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>LUCY: la: sapore?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the: taste?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here Lucy displays her concern for the morphosyntactic accuracy of their translation by asking: would that be right ... grammatically? (lines 61 and 64). In response to Lucy’s question, both Mary and John orient to the prepositional phrase produced before (per aprire, “to open”). More specifically, John repeats the Italian preposition per (“for, to”, line 66), while Mary offers a word-by-word retranslation of the Italian phrase with for to open (line 67).

At this point, in line 69, Lucy offers a candidate continuation of the line that would then look like: per aprire la sapore (“to open the taste”). This action displays Lucy’s implicit acceptance of Mary’s prior turn as an adequate second pair part to her question in lines 61 and 64: Mary’s turn in line 67 was a successful attempt at determining the accuracy of the Italian translation. Lucy’s completion – delivered with rising intonation – is offered for confirmation. Since no response is forthcoming (line 70), Lucy offers taste (line 71) as the English translation of sapore (line 69), possibly in an attempt to pursue agreement from her coparticipants.

However, in overlap, John orients to a different course of action (line 72): reformulating in English the definition line so far created for aperitivo. Keeping his eye gaze on Mary’s notes, he initially produces it opens (line 73); then he offers a word-by-word reformulation of the line-so-far (lines 74-75) and completes it with the object your
palate (proposed in Figure 5.23, line 11, and not yet translated into Italian): >it’s an alcoholic drink,< (.0) tch- your palate. After doing a private moment of cognition (see the upward looking eye gaze in line 76, the pauses and the token #u:::h# in line 75), John finally produces the relevant second pair part to Lucy’s question in lines 61 and 64: _YEAH_ (line 77). The Italian translation is right (line 79), since – in English – they would use the infinitive as well: the Italian expression _per aprire_ is grammatically accurate, because its syntactic structure corresponds to that of the English formulation.

The fragment in Figure 5.26 is excerpted from group B’s second planning session. The participants here are working on Jenny’s script. After creating a script line introducing the topics of Jenny’s presentation (i.e., traditional foods, puppet shows, and other important traditions for the celebration of Carnival in Venice), Jenny and Emily work on each topic in more detail. They look for more specific information for each topic and create script lines to convey that information in Italian. In the stretch of talk reported below, the participants are working on a line that introduces the topic of puppet shows.

FIGURE 5.26 – IS THAT PROPER ENGLISH? ITALIAN? (Group B, Session 2)

```
1 JENNY: so. (.). \[un’ altra tradizione che è comune::,\]
\[an-F other-F tradition-F that is commo::n,\]
\[another tradition that is commo::n,\]
((reading))

2 (0.7) mtch- (.). _sono_, (0.8) _are_,

3 \>°that is common,"< (.). _a:re_ (.). _are_ (0.2)

4 _is common_, (0.2) _are_ \>puppet shows\<?

5 (0.4)

6 JENNY: is that (.). prope:r (.). english;

7 (.)

8 \[italian;\]

9 \[((Emily shakes head))\]

10

11 EMILY: hhh hh
```
FIGURE 5.26 (cont.)

12  (0.4)
13 EMILY: >another tradition< that is common,
14 [ (2.0) 
15 [ [looks up; facial expression suggesting uncertainty])
16 i::s:::
17 (1.1)
18 JENNY: [ [moves pen to notebook])
19 [it would be (.) [is.] = so,]
20 EMILY: [are.]
21 (0.2)
22 EMILY: [yeah. (.) > right. <=
23 [ [ (Jenny writes "è")]
24 JENNY: = è::,  
25 = i::s,  
26 [ (1.1)
27 [ [ (Emily turns to look at Jenny’s script))
28 JENNY: ’cause (. ) i’m just talking about one 
29 tradition. so: > it < would be:
30 EMILY: "an:other[ :r,"]
31 JENNY: [singular.
32 EMILY: > i think< un altro: " then ".
33 an the:r-
34 m-
35 (1.2)
36 JENNY: [writes])
37 "an other[ :r,"]
38 EMILY: ["un a"]tro:
39 ["an other[ : r-"m]
40 ["an other[ : r"o
41 JENNY: [ tradizione che è c]omune [è:::
42 [tradizione: n-F that is common [i:::s
43 [tradizione: n that is common [i:::s
44 [looks at the screen])
45 [ (0.7)
46 [ ( (Jenny starts writing))
47 (0.4)
48 EMILY: ["tradizione che è c]omune [è:::
49 [tradizione: n-F that is common [i:::s
50 [tradizione: n that is common [i:::s
51 [looks at the screen])
52 (0.7)
53 [ ( (Jenny starts writing))
The transcript picks up as Jenny reads aloud the part of the script line they have agreed on so far: un’altra tradizione che è comune::< (“another tradition that is common”, line 1). She then engages in a continuation of the line and, after displaying some trouble (see the pauses and the perturbation mtch- in line 3), Jenny produces the verb form sono (“are”, line 3). As it appears from the following lines (specifically, line 5), the next due item in the sentence would be the Italian equivalent of puppet shows. That is, Jenny is working on a line that would look like this: un’altra tradizione che è comune sono (puppet shows) (“another tradition that is common are (puppet shows)”). The 0.8 second pause in line 3, though, indicates that the next projected item (i.e., the Italian equivalent of puppet shows) is not immediately forthcoming. However, as the subsequent lines show, the nature of Jenny’s trouble in the continuation of the script line is not lexical, but syntactic. That is, the problem to which she orients in lines 4-5 is not the translation of the expression puppet shows into Italian, but rather the production of the accurate subject-verb agreement in the utterance she is constructing. And here is when the practice of translation into the L1 comes into play. Jenny in fact translates che è comune ... sono (lines 1 and 3) into English >“that is common,“< (. a:re (. are) (line 4). The low volume and the speeded up delivery of that is common indicate how that expression is not Jenny’s focal concern. Rather, the trouble she orients to is the following verb, are (see the stress on the first syllable in both the occurrences of this item).
As will become apparent, the participants’ line of reasoning is that, if the subject of the sentence is singular, then both the predicate of the relative clause \((that\ is\ common)\) and the predicate of the main clause should be conjugated in the third person singular form. The sentence in English should then look as follows: \textit{another tradition that is common is (puppet shows)}. Therefore, the formulation \textit{another tradition that is common are (puppet shows)} (see lines 4-5) – which indeed translates Italian \textit{un’altra tradizione che è comune sono (gli spettacoli di burattini)} – seems neither proper English nor proper Italian (lines 7-9). In other words, the translation of the line-so-far into English triggers doubts about the accuracy of both formulations; i.e., the first formulation in Italian and its English equivalent.

As Jenny displays her uncertainty about the accuracy of the script line with \textit{is that (.) proper (.) English¿ (.) Italian¿} (lines 7-9), Emily shows affiliation with her by shaking her head (line 10) and laughing (line 11). Emily then formulates the entire sentence in English with the two predicates conjugated in the third person singular form: \textit{\(<another tradition>\ that\ is\ common, (2.0) is::s:::\)} (lines 13-16). However, during the 2.0 second pause (line 14) that precedes the delivery of the second verb form (line 16), Emily looks up and moves her mouth in such a way that her overall facial expression suggests uncertainty (line 15). In other words, Emily nonverbally portrays herself as a not-knowing participant with respect to the accurate verb form that would fit in that syntactic slot. So, while she offers \textit{i::s::} as a possibly accurate form in line 16, in her next turn, in overlap with Jenny’s acceptance of \textit{is} (line 19), Emily produces \textit{are} (line 20).

On the other hand, it appears that the matter is settled for Jenny: in English the accurate verb form would be \textit{is} (line 19) and, as she says so, Jenny moves her pen to her
notebook (line 18), thereby showing that she is ready to write the equivalent Italian form in the script. The video distinctly shows Jenny writing è (line 23), as Emily says yea:h. (.) >“right.”< (line 22).

Now, given the overlap of is and are in lines 19-20, Emily’s turn in line 22 is rather ambiguous: it is not clear whether she is expressing agreement with Jenny’s take on the accuracy of is or whether she is confirming that are is indeed the accurate form. Moreover, Emily’s nonverbal behavior does not help in disambiguating what she means: Emily keeps looking ahead and is therefore disengaged from her coparticipant and not oriented to her writing. At this point, Jenny verbally produces the Italian equivalent of is (è::, line 24) and, as Emily turns to look at Jenny’s script (line 26), Jenny provides an account for the accuracy of the third person singular form: since she is talking about one tradition, the verb form should be singular (lines 27-28 and 30).

Here, though, Emily orients to another trouble source: she repeats “an:oth:er:” (line 29), as in another tradition and suggests that Jenny replaces un’altra (“another”, feminine) with un altro (“another”, masculine). Emily’s suggestion is not relevant and inaccurate. In fact, by saying then in >i think< un altro: “then” (line 31), Emily is linking her line of reasoning about the use of another to Jenny’s line of reasoning about the need for a singular versus a plural form. In other words, Emily projects her repair as a repair on a number issue. But, in fact, she suggests a repair in gender: from feminine un’altra to masculine un altro. Her repair is therefore not relevant to the matter at hand and is also inaccurate, since tradizione is feminine and thus requires a feminine adjective. Nevertheless, Jenny unproblematically accepts Emily’s repair (line 35) and changes the a
(in *altro*) into an *o* (as in *altro*) in her script (line 34). The two participants then read together what they have gotten so far: *un altro tradizione che è comune è* (lines 36-39). Jenny then looks at the screen (line 40), possibly at a website with the relevant information, and starts writing the last part of the sentence: *spettacolo di burattini* (“puppet show”, lines 42-46).

In sum, the fragments reproduced in Figures 5.25 and 5.26 display the participants’ orientation to a comparison between morpho-syntactic structures in the two languages, assuming that what is correct in the L1 will be correct in the L2 as well.

5.7.3 (Re)translation into English to verify the accuracy of L2 meaning

(Re)translation is also used to verify the lexical accuracy of L2 words or the overall meaning of a passage written in Italian. This practice is enacted by relying on three different sources of knowledge: the speaker’s own knowledge, the coparticipants’ knowledge, and external sources of knowledge (e.g., an online dictionary).

The fragment in Figure 5.27 is an excerpt from group A’s second planning session.

FIGURE 5.27 – BIENVENUTI: IS THAT WELCOME? (Group A, Session 2)

1 MARY: *b/i/envenuti,=is that welcome?*

2

3 JOHN: *b/i/envenuti.=absolutely.*

4

5

6 MARY:[((Mary writes))]

7

8 MARY: alright.

---

110 Note however that, at a later moment, Jenny corrects this issue in the written script.
The participants here are working on the opening line for their presentation, which welcomes their classmates to the imaginary restaurant *Pasta Hut*. In line 1 Mary offers *welcome* as a translation of the word *b/i/envenuti*.\(^{111}\) Mary thus relies on her own knowledge to propose the equivalence between the two words, but her translation – formatted as a question (*is that welcome?*) – is offered for confirmation to her coparticipants. Upon John’s confirmation (line 3),\(^{112}\) Mary repeats the Italian word (line 6) while writing in her notebook (line 5): if the Italian expression is right, it can be written in the script for the presentation.

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.28 is excerpted from group A’s second planning session as well. The participants here have just started to do some definition work on *aperitif*.

**FIGURE 5.28 – UN APERITIVO È UN DRINK (Group A, Session 2)**

1. **LUCY:** *u::n, (0.4) aperitivo * *è::, (0.2) u::::h (0.3) a::n, aperitif i::s,*
2. .hh *u:n: (1.0) drink,*
   \[ \overline{a::} \overline{drink} \]
3. \[(1.5)\]
4. \[{{(expression of uncertainty on Lucy’s face)}}\]
5. \[{{(John looks at Lucy)}}\]
6. **JOHN:** *{{(keeps looking at Lucy)}}*
7. \[tch- (0.2) bevanda? drink?\]
8. \[(0.8)\]
9. **LUCY:** *°bevan[da]°*
   \[°dri[nk].°\]
10. \[{{(Lucy looks at Mary)}}\]
11. **JOHN:** *is that the word?=

\(^{111}\) This is an incorrect form for *benvenuti*. It presents a possible crosslinguistic interference with Spanish *bienvenidos* or with French *bienvenue*.

\(^{112}\) Note how John responds with a nonconforming response (Raymond, 2003) that emphasizes John’s epistemic authority in settling the matter. With *bienvenuti*, produced with downward intonation, John confirms the accuracy of the translation. At the same time, *absolutely* adds a strong claim of certainty to the affirmative response he is giving.
In this fragment, the students resort to an online dictionary as a source of higher epistemic authority. In lines 1-2 Lucy starts formulating the definition of aperitif: un aperitivo è un drink (“an aperitif is a drink”). The pauses and the elongated u:::h (line 1) display Lucy’s uncertainty in finding an appropriate term, until she settles on drink (line 2), a loanword commonly used in Italian. However, Lucy’s facial expression conveys doubt (line 4), John sees it (line 5), and initiates repair on the word drink by providing an Italian equivalent for it: bevanda (line 7). The rising intonation, coupled with John’s eye gaze direction (line 6), conveys that this word is offered to Lucy for confirmation. After a 0.8 second pause (line 8), Lucy softly repeats “bevanda” (line 9). Note that, as she simultaneously produces the last syllable in her turn, Lucy looks at Mary (line 9), possibly in an attempt to involve this participant in the repair. At this point John, whose turn in line 7 made relevant a response from Lucy, initiates repair on bevanda with is that the word? (line 11), thereby displaying his interpretation of Lucy’s delayed response as a further display of uncertainty that questions the accuracy of the
word he has just proposed. This repair too is directed at Lucy, as indicated by John’s eye
gaze. Instead of producing a second pair part, though, Lucy too initiates repair with is it
right? (line 12), while Mary produces a hesitation token (line 13) and starts searching
online (line 14). All the participants now look at the website on the computer screen
(lines 17 and 22), where the accuracy of bevanda will be verified against its
corresponding English equivalent. Finally, Mary’s positive assessment (good fjo:b, line
23) conveys that John was right: the Italian equivalent for drink is indeed bevanda. The
students’ persistence in looking for the accurate L2 word also demonstrates their
orientation to a strict Italian-only use in their presentation.

The fragment in Figure 5.29 is excerpted from group C’s fourth planning session.

FIGURE 5.29 – CAN YOU USE LIKE FREQUENTARE? (Group C, Session 4)
1 KITTY: [(               )]
2 DONNY: [okay. so::. wait.]  
3     (0.5)
4 DONNY: [i have a question.]  
5 KITTY: [(standing there.)]
6     (0.2)
7 DONNY: u:hm: (1.2) can (you)=use like frequentare, to-frequent,
8     (0.3)
9 DONNY: >is like−< like u:hm (0.4) >i’m like< (0.4)
10 nell’ inverno:: u:hm (0.5) u:h (.). l’italia:
in the winte::r the italy:
in the winte::r
11 settentrionale:: è più frequentata ( ) (0.7)
northe::rn is more frequented
northe::rn italy: is more frequented
12 dai: sciatori,
by-the: skiers,
by: skiers,
FIGURE 5.29 (cont.)

![Figure 5.30 A line in Donny’s script (group C)](image)

13 [(0.2)
14 [((Kitty looks at her screen; Annie looks down))
15 DONNY: s-
16 [(0.6)
17 [((Kitty looks at her screen; Annie looks down))
18 DONNY: °skiers.°
19 (1.1)
20 ANNIE: [it sounds ↑fine.
21 [((keeps looking down))
22 [(0.4)
23 [((Kitty turns to look at Donny))
24 DONNY: >it’s like< frequented?
25 (0.3)
26 KITTY: I:[: ]
27 DONNY: °[°it’]s- (0.2) i think that it’s [right.°]
28 KITTY: I:: used
29 fr/i/quentare fo::r: (0.6)
to-attend
30 DONNY: °you said /’frikwant/. that’s why ( )°
31 [((smiles))
32 (0.3)
33 KITTY: °yeah.°
34 (0.5)
35 KITTY: the student, (0.2) like (.) gli studenti: (.) the students:
36 potranno: fr/i/quentare
will-be-able: to-attend
37 [((Annie smiles, turns to Donny))
38 un’opera: [all’ arena.
an opera: [at-the arena.
39 [((turns to Donny))
40 [((Donny is smiling))]
41 (0.7) ((Annie and Donny keep smiling))
42

43 KITTY: [like (.) they can attend,]
44 ((glances at Annie))

45 (0.3)
46 KITTY: isn’t that, (0.2) fr/i/quen[tare ] is like attend?
47     to-at[tend ]
48
49 DONNY:
50 (yeah.)

51 (0.3)
52 DONNY: does it? “so (then/that) (.) maybe not,”
53 (0.4)
54 KITTY: ma- maybe ↑no::t.
55 DONNY: no:: it does mean attend.
56 ANNIE: what if we show up late?
57 (0.7)

The transcript picks up at the end of a telling initiated by Kitty in lines not reported here.

As the telling is closing, Donny orient to a new course of action (okay. so::: wait, line 2) and announces that he has a question (line 4). He then asks whether it is possible to use the verb frequentare (“to attend, to frequent”, line 7) and provides the relevant context: in his script (see Figure 5.30 in the transcript) he has written nell’inverno l’Italia settentrionale è più frequentata dai sciatori (“in the winter, Northern Italy is frequented more by skiers”, lines 10-12).113 His coparticipants, however, do not provide a response (see the silences in lines 13 and 16) and display disengagement. In fact, Kitty looks at her computer screen and seems to be working on her slides, while Annie looks down (possibly at her phone; lines 14 and 17). In an attempt to pursue a response from them, Donny translates Italian sciatori into English “skiers” (line 18). With this action, he

113 The word più (“more”, line 11) does not appear on Donny’s script as reproduced in Figure 5.30. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine whether Donny is here quoting an earlier version of his script or whether he is adding the word più as he orally delivers the line.
orients to the Italian form as possibly not known to his coparticipants and therefore provides relevant information (i.e., the equivalent English form) that might help Kitty and Annie in determining the accuracy of his sentence and, more specifically, of his use of the verb *frequentare*. After yet another silence (line 19), Annie keeps looking down (line 21) as she positively assesses Donny’s line (*it sounds fine*, line 20). At this point, another silence ensues (line 22) and Kitty finally turns to look at Donny (line 23). Despite Annie’s positive assessment, however, Donny pursues further agreement on his lexical choice (possibly because of Annie’s disengagement, visible in her nonverbal behavior, and because of the lack of a response by Kitty in the talk-so-far). He thus offers a translation of the specific form he used in his script, *frequentata*, into English *frequented* (line 24). At this point, Annie is still looking down, but Kitty and Donny are now maintaining mutual eye gaze and the upward intonation suggests that Donny is offering his translation for confirmation. However, Kitty does not respond right away (see the silence in line 25) and Donny provides a mitigated assessment of the accuracy of that lexical item: “*i think that it’s right*” (line 27, where the mitigation effect is conveyed by the use of *I think*; see also the low volume in the delivery of Donny’s turn).

At this point, instead of providing a response to Donny’s actions, Kitty volunteers to give some information about how she used the verb *frequentare* (lines 28-29) in her own script (see Figure 5.31). As it will become apparent, Kitty has used the Italian verb with the meaning of “to attend”. What matters here, though, is that she pronounces *fr/e/quentare* as *fr/i/quentare* and Donny brings this pronunciation issue into relevance by teasing Kitty in line 30: she used the English pronunciation for the adjective\(^\text{114}\) *frequent*.

\(^{114}\) As marked in the transcript, in pronouncing the word *frequent* Donny stresses the first syllable.
(i.e., /ˈfrikwɑnt/) in the Italian word *frequentare*. Kitty however keeps looking at her screen and does not seem to orient to the teasing nature of Donny’s comment. She then reads the line in her script where she used the verb *frequentare*: *gli studenti potranno frequentare un’opera all’Arena* (“the students will be able to attend an opera at the Arena”, lines 35-38). At the end of her turn, Kitty shifts her eye gaze from the computer screen to Donny (line 39), thereby making relevant a response from him. After all, he is the one who raised the issue about the lexical accuracy of *frequentare* and he is thus the primary recipient of her turn. When Kitty looks at him, Donny is smiling (line 40), since – in reading the line in her script – Kitty again pronounced the Italian verb incorrectly (line 36). This time, her mispronunciation has been noticed by Annie as well, who – upon hearing *fr/i/* instead of *fr/e/* – smiles and turns to Donny (line 37). In line 42 Annie and Donny keep smiling and do not produce any uptake to Kitty’s turn (see the pause in line 41), while Kitty does not affiliate with their smiles. On the contrary, she pursues the action of reaching an agreement about the accurate use of *frequentare* and translates *potranno frequentare* (“will be able to attend”) into English with *they can attend* (line 43). This time Kitty glances at Annie (line 44), thereby trying to involve this participant in determining the accuracy of *frequentare*, as a verb meaning “to attend” versus “to frequent”*. Once again, no response is forthcoming (line 45) and Kitty packages her following turn with a specific question format. That is, she explicitly asks – with a reversed polarity question (Koshik, 2002) – whether *frequentare* is equivalent to *attend* (line 46). In other words, she is asserting that *frequentare* and *attend* have the same meaning, but she formats this propositional content as a question, so that a response is made explicitly relevant by the grammatical packaging of the turn. Donny confirms
(yeah, line 47), but then seems to be casting some doubt on the stated equivalence between the two terms (line 49). Kitty affiliates with Donny’s apparent doubt (line 51), but then Donny reconfirms that frequentare does mean attend (line 52). Annie then introduces a new topic (what if we show up late?, line 53) and the discussion over the lexical accuracy of frequentare is not reopened.

Overall, in this fragment the practice of translation into the L1 seems to have two functions. More specifically, it is employed to: 1) verify the accuracy of an L2 item; and 2) to solicit a response from the coparticipants, in an environment of apparent disengagement. As we have seen in the analysis, Donny initiates the sequence by issuing a first pair part regarding the accuracy of an L2 form (line 7) and provides an example of its use within an Italian sentence (lines 9-12), but the coparticipants look somewhat disengaged (as in lines 13-14, 16-17). A translation into the L1 (lines 18 and 24) provides the coparticipants with a further piece of knowledge that might help them to decide over the accuracy of the Italian term. By providing this extra piece of information, the translation scaffolds and, at the same time, solicits the coparticipants’ response. Similarly, Kitty resorts to the practice of translation into the L1 (lines 43 and 46) when – after providing an example in Italian (lines 35-38) – her coparticipants do not produce any uptake (lines 41 and 45).

Finally, in terms of knowledge sources, the students in this fragment rely on their own knowledge of the two languages, and use their linguistic artifacts as concrete examples of how a term can be used within an Italian sentence. These artifacts provide the relevant linguistic context that allows the participants to determine, through a (re)translation into the L1, whether an L2 expression is accurately used or not.

---

115 By looking at the video it is clear that Donny is not smiling and not joking here.
In conclusion, the fragments analyzed in this subsection have illustrated one aspect of the interplay between the L1 and the L2. In their orientation to the accuracy of L2 vocabulary, the students resort to their L1 to verify the correctness of an L2 word and of its specific uses in the sentences they produced as their final artifacts. In doing so, the students rely on their knowledge of the two languages and – when in doubt – on external sources (i.e., online dictionaries) evidently deemed to have higher epistemic authority.

5.7.4 Translation into English as a tool for doing remembering

The practice of translation into the L1, however, is not only used to verify the accuracy of a single lexical item. As the fragment in Figure 5.32 illustrates, the practice of translation can be rather more extensive and concern an entire passage written by the participants in Italian. The stretch of talk reported in the fragment occurs at the beginning of group D’s first planning session. A month before, during regular class time, the students discussed possible topics for their presentation and their final project, and had to submit a summary of the discussion to the teacher. At the beginning of this session, the participants use that summary as a reminder of the topics they had discussed earlier in class. Specifically, one of the students, Marta, engages in translating the summary into English. Upon encountering trouble with a specific sentence, Marta reads the problematic part in Italian and her coparticipants join in the translation effort in order to disambiguate the meaning of that sentence.

FIGURE 5.32 – SO IT COSTS LESS IN ITALY (Group D, Session 1)

| 1 MARTA: | in america::: you finish in four year- |
| 2       | >you usually finish in four years< while in ital/j/- |

Figure 5.33 Third bullet point in the students’ summary (group D)
in=uh in italy:, (0.6) there’s no:t a time limi:t,
and most people take longer, (0.9)
this is also beca:use?:

[(3.0)
[(Roberta turns to look at Marta)]

( )=[what is this.

[(

9

(0.4)

11 MARTA: [((reading))
[ in italia lo studio costa:: pochissimo
[in italy the study costs:: very-little
[studying in italy costs:: very little

13 [“in confronto all’americ:-america:,”
[“in comparison with-the americ:-america:,”
[“in comparison with americ:-america:,”

14 ROBERTA: [“yeah.”]
15 ANDY: [ costs ] less.

16 (0.3)
17 ROBERTA: “costs less.”
18 (0.2)
19 MARTA: o:kay.
20 (0.9)
21 MARTA: so it [costs less: >in italy.<
22 [((Lucio nods))]

23 ROBERTA: mh mh.
24 MARTA: okay.
25 (0.3)
26 ANDY: “much.”
27 (1.4)

The transcript picks up as Marta is giving a word-by-word translation of one of the bullet points in the summary (reproduced in Figure 5.33 above). When she gets to the last sentence in the summary (questo è anche perché in Italia lo studio costa pochissimo
"in confronto all’America, “this is also why studying in Italy costs very little in comparison with America”), Marta translates the first part (this is also because: , line 5), but then encounters trouble with the translation of the second part of the sentence. A 3.0 second pause follows (line 6), during which Roberta turns to look at Marta (line 7). Marta then initiates repair by asking what is this (line 8), as she points at her computer screen, while Roberta leans toward it (see the frame grab in line 9; the participants are - from left to right – Andy, Lucio, Roberta and Marta).

Clearly, Marta’s pointing gesture identifies a specific referent for this only for Roberta and possibly for Lucio. Roberta and Lucio are in fact looking at Marta’s screen. Andy, meanwhile, is intently looking at his own screen. Thus, in order to make the trouble source accessible to all the coparticipants, including Andy, Marta reads it aloud: in italia lo studio costa:: pochissimo “in confronto all’ameri- america:”, (“studying in Italy costs very little in comparison with America”, lines 12-13). In overlap with Roberta’s acknowledgment token “yeah” (line 14), Andy provides the gist of the sentence in English, by saying costs less (line 15): studying in Italy costs less than in America (literally, costa pochissimo translates into costs very little). Roberta repeats this approximate translation (line 17), Marta accepts it (o:kay, line 19), and then displays her understanding of the sentence by providing a final upshot: so it costs less: >in italy< (line 21). Lucio, Marta and Roberta agree (lines 22-24), while Andy adds “much” (line 26) as an element that completes the gist of the sentence provided by Marta before: studying in Italy costs much less. The participants then move on to the next part of the summary.
In conclusion, the analysis of this fragment has shown how the practice of translation into the L1, begun as an individual endeavor by Marta, can turn into a collaborative effort. The participants here resort to this practice for two purposes: (i) to remind themselves of what they had agreed on in a prior occasion, and (ii) to establish a shared understanding of problematic sentences in the L2. Both these actions are essential to guarantee the progressivity of the planning process. In this specific case, in fact, the participants need to agree on the content and the meaning of the summary they wrote in class, so that they can choose relevant topics for their presentation and plan accordingly.

5.8 Other functions of L2 use

The previous sections have investigated how the two languages in the participants’ repertoire are used in patterns of language alternation to mark the distinction between the planning process and its product. In the local interactional order accomplished and maintained over the planning sessions, English is used to do planning talk, while Italian is used for the expressions that the students are going to use in their presentation. Occasionally, with a deviation from the normative interactional order enacted by the participants (and a deviation that may or may not be an actual codeswitch), Italian can become the language of the process, while English may temporarily convey the planning outcome.

The present section will illustrate other cases of deviation from the local interactional order; specifically, cases where Italian is not used as a semiotic resource to mark the process versus product distinction. The following examples will in fact show how Italian is used to reissue assessments (subsection 5.8.1), to redo an action previously done in English in the same sequential environment (subsection 5.8.2), to mark the
beginning or the end of a planning session (subsection 5.8.3). All these are instances of CS for discourse-related purposes.

5.8.1 Assessments reissued in Italian

This subsection analyzes two examples where an assessment, at first formulated in English, is then reissued with an equivalent Italian expression for emphatic purposes and to extend the speaker’s course of action in the face of competing courses of action enacted by the coparticipants.

The fragment in Figure 5.34 is extracted from group A’s second planning session.

FIGURE 5.34 – I LIKE CHEESE (Group A, Session 2)

1 MARY: so we’ve #go:t# aperitivo:, (2.0) antipasto::, (1.6) aperitif:, appetize::r,
2 u::hm (2.8) °°primo:::,°° (.) °secon::do::,°° °first cou:::rse,°° °second cou:::rse,°
3 (0.3)
4 MARY: °>we’ve (got) to think about< the examples for the:se.°
5 (0.8)
6 JOHN: <“con to:r no::,”°>
   <“side di: sh::,”°>
7 MARY: °contorno::,° frut=that’s my favorite.
   °sidedish::,° fru-
8 formaggio:, frutta?
   cheese:, fruit?
9 (0.2)
10 JOHN: o:h yeah.
11 (0.3)
12 MARY: °“big fa:an.”°
13 (0.3)
14 JOHN: o:h yeah.
15 (0.4)
16 MARY? °“mh mh mh mh.”°
17 (1.2)
18 LUCY: i like chee:se:
19 (0.7)
20 JOHN: hh hu hu chee:se.
21 LUCY: he he [ (0.4) ] hhhhh
   [([laughs silently)])
22 (0.4)
23 MARY: °(ri:ght.)°
The transcript picks up when all the participants are looking at a webpage on the computer screen, while Mary is copying in her notebook the names of all the courses they will illustrate during their presentation. The listing of the courses (lines 1-6) engenders an assessment sequence about some of them. This sequence starts when Mary issues a positive assessment of the course consisting of cheese and fruit\textsuperscript{116} (\textit{that’s my favorite}, lines 7-8). After John’s agreement (\textit{o:h yeah}, line 10), Mary reinstates her assessment by announcing that she is a big fan of cheese and fruit (line 12); her assessment meets again with John’s agreement (\textit{o:h yeah}, line 14). At this point, Lucy – who has not so far affiliated with her coparticipants’ stance – positively assesses the cheese component of this meal stage: \textit{i like cheese!} (line 18). Her assessment, conveyed with emphatic intonation, triggers John’s laughter (line 20), which is reciprocated by Lucy herself (lines 21-22). Mary, on the other hand, orients to bringing the assessment sequence to a close (with \textit{right} in line 23 and \textit{alright} in line 25). In contrast with the course of action proposed by Mary, Lucy repeats her previous assessment in Italian (\textit{piace formaggio!}, “(i) like cheese”, line 26)\textsuperscript{117} and again marks the delivery with prosodic emphasis. Lucy’s turn gets further laughter from John (line 27), but ultimately Mary manages to

\textsuperscript{116} This corresponds to one of the “meal stages” identified on Wikipedia: \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Italian_cuisine#Meal_structure}

\textsuperscript{117} I take Lucy’s expression as an incomplete Italian translation of her assessment in line 18: \textit{i like cheese}. The complete translation would be \textit{mi piace il formaggio} (literally, “cheese is likable to me”).
move on to the next course of action; i.e., completing the list, by mentioning *digestivo* ("digestif", line 28), the last item on the menu.

Lucy’s assessment in Italian is an actual codeswitch: it is an instance of language alternation with respect to the prior turn, and it is also a deviation from the overall interactional order according to which Italian is used mainly to express the planning product. However, it is important to note that, with the assessment sequence initiated by Mary in line 7, the interactional order pertinent to the activity of planning is suspended. The assessment sequence is in fact an aside through which the participants do ordinary conversation. Now, while Mary soon re-orient to the main planning activity, Lucy tries to dwell on doing mundane conversation, by extending the assessment sequence; by reissuing her assessment in Italian, she makes her action more salient.

The fragment in Figure 5.35 represents a case similar to the one presented in Figure 5.34. The stretch of talk is excerpted from group D’s first planning session.

**FIGURE 5.35 – I HATE GROUP PROJECTS (Group D, Session 1)**

1 LUCIO: alright!
2 (0.5)
3 ANDY: tch- [( )]
4 LUCIO: [this sounds progress,]
5 (0.3)
6 MARTA: u:hm
7 (1.4)
8 DAVID: [((singing))]
9 [i hate
10 (0.4)
11 MARTA: tch- [great. so Italian school]
12 DAVID: [group projects.]
13 [((singing))
14 MARTA: [structure in-]
15 ROBERTA: [hh he he hhhh]
16 LUCIO: [hh hu hu hu ]
FIGURE 5.35 (cont.)

17 MARTA: [((smiles))
18 [((Andy starts smiling))]
19 [Italian school]=
20 ROBERTA: [he he he he ]
21 MARTA: =struc[ture in [ge]ner]al
22 ROBERTA: [hh hhh]
23 LUCIO: [/bo://:]

24

25 MARTA: [>what would be li:ke,<]
26 LUCIO: [(                    )]
27 ROBERTA: [ºhh hhº
28 [((Andy, Lucio, and Roberta look at David))]
29 DAVID: [((singing))
30 [o:dio progetti di gruppi:]
31 [i]ha:te projects of grou:ps!
32 [i]ha:te grou:p projects!

Specifically, at the beginning of the session, after translating the summary of possible topics they discussed in class (see Figure 5.32), the participants agree on the general topic of the presentation: they will talk about the Italian school system. The transcript picks up when Lucio ratifies the agreement with *alright!* (line 1) and positively assesses the session so far by saying *this sounds progress* (line 4). Marta – who is the self-selected secretary of the group – agrees with Lucio (*great*, line 11) and, after a resumptive *so* (Bolden, 2006, 2008, 2009; Streeck, 2002), mentions again the main topic of their presentation (*so. italian school structure*, lines 11 and 14). Then, as becomes apparent in further development of the talk not reported here, she orients to the next course of action:
discussing possible subtopics that are related to the Italian school system. However, before Marta issues her assessment of the session (line 11) and then in partial overlap with her turn, David sings his assessment of the situation: \textit{i hate group projects} (lines 8-9 and 12-13). David’s action engenders laughter tokens from Roberta (lines 15 and 20) and Lucio (line 16), and smiles from everybody (including Andy, in line 18, and Marta, in line 17). Clearly, then, with his singing performance, David has managed to get his coparticipants’ attention. After this moment of shared amusement, though, Marta quickly resumes a serious expression and orients to the main course of action (lines 21 and 25). On the other hand, the other coparticipants still orient to the humorous moment generated by David. Lucio, in particular, looks at David, says /bo/:: (line 23) and makes a hand gesture (line 24). I interpret these actions as some sort of assessment of David’s performance, as if Lucio were jokingly booing David. Lucio then makes some further unintelligible commentary and intersperses his turn with laughter tokens (line 26). When Roberta briefly laughs (line 27), Roberta, Lucio, and Andy are all looking at David (line 28). And it is precisely at this point that David enacts a new performance by singing \textit{o:dio progetti di gruppi:!} (lines 29-30), which is the Italian equivalent of \textit{I hate group projects}. David’s second performance generates another moment of shared laughter to which all the students (including Marta) participate (not transcribed).

In conclusion, as in Lucy’s second assessment in Figure 5.34, David’s singing performance in Italian is an actual codeswitch that gives more salience to the speaker’s action, while extending a humorous moment in competition with a very different course of action by Marta, who is oriented to the on-task goal of planning the presentation.
5.8.2 Redoing the same action in Italian

The fragment reproduced in Figure 5.36 occurs at the end of group D’s first planning session. After listing various subtopics and creating an outline for the presentation, the participants assign the topics to individual presenters.

FIGURE 5.36 – ME (Group D, Session 1)

MARTA: [((looking at her computer screen))]
[WHO wants to (0.3) talk about]
[>Italian school structure in general.<=th[at me]ns=
LUCIO: [me. ]

MARTA: [((looking at her computer screen))]
[=pre high school, high school, admission to university
[and univer[sity].

LUCIO: io.
i.
me.

(0.6)

MARTA: okay.

The transcript picks up when Marta initiates the action of assigning topics by asking

\textit{WHO wants to (0.3) talk about >Italian school structure in general.}< (lines 2-3). To this question she quickly latches a description of what the rubric “Italian school structure in general” includes: the projected presenter for that topic will have to talk about \textit{pre high school, high school, admission to university and university} (lines 3 and 6-7). Note that, in so doing, Marta is constantly looking at her computer screen (lines 1 and 5), where all the possible topics are listed, and it is only at the end of her description that she turns to her coparticipants (line 8) and presents herself as available for a response. However, Lucio had already issued a second pair part in line 4; in fact, to the question \textit{who wants to talk about Italian school structure in general} (lines 2-3) Lucio had replied \textit{me} (line 4). His response, though, overlapped with the beginning of Marta’s description. It is not possible to determine whether Marta actually heard him or not. What is clear is that she
does not show any uptake of Lucio’s response, neither verbally nor nonverbally. Lucio then waits for the end of Marta’s turn and reissues his second pair part. He resorts to Italian (io, literally “I”, line 9), however, with a codeswitch that is probably meant to avoid the exact repetition of the same action in the same sequential slot: the function of Lucio’s turn in Italian is the same, but the format is different.

5.8.3 Using the L2 to mark the beginning or the end of a planning session

Clear cases of CS for discourse-related purposes are represented by the fragments in Figures 5.37 and 5.38, where a switch to Italian respectively marks the beginning and the end of the planning session. The fragment in Figure 5.37 occurs at the beginning of group D’s first planning session. The fifth member of the group, David, has just come in and the participants have been interacting in the L1.

FIGURE 5.37 – L2 AT THE BEGINNING OF A SESSION (Group D, Session 1)

1 MARTA: okay:. (. ) u:::hm
2 (1.7)
3 ANDY: cominciamo,
   let’s start,
4 (0.5)
5 LUCIO: cominciamo.
   let’s start.
6 (0.7)
7 ROBERTA: [((turns to Marta and David))
8 [”>do we ( ) to speak in Itali[an]?”]
9 MARTA: [no. ]
10 DAVID: [no. ]=
11 =we don’t.
12 (0.7)
13 LUCIO: ”ye(h)ah(h).”
14 ROBERTA: whew! [hhhhhh hh     ]
15 ANDY: [we would not be able to] get done fast enough.
16 (2.7)

Marta’s okay: (line 1) closes the prior interaction and she keeps the floor with the token u:::hm (line 1). The use of okay is an ambiguous language choice: the English token is
commonly used in Italian as well. At this point, Andy invites the coparticipants to start the session with the imperative *cominciamo* (“let’s start”, line 3), delivered with slightly rising intonation. After a 0.5 second pause in line 4 (a hesitation which possibly indicates that Andy’s coparticipants have reservations about his language choice), Lucio aligns with the course of action proposed by Andy and repeats the imperative with downward intonation (*cominciamo*, “let’s start”, line 5). This use of Italian at the beginning of the planning session is explicitly interpreted by Roberta as an indication that they might have to speak Italian during their meeting (line 8). Marta and David then simultaneously reply that they do not have to (lines 9-11), Lucio confirms their response (line 13) and, upon Roberta’s display of relief (line 14), Andy provides an account for not using Italian in the planning process: *we would not be able to get done fast enough* (line 15). The action performed by Andy’s turn suggests that he never oriented to the actual use of Italian to do planning talk, but that he just used Italian in line 3 to mark the beginning of the planning session.

The fragment in Figure 5.38 occurs at the end of group A’s first planning session.

FIGURE 5.38 – END OF SESSION TALK (Group A, Session 1)

1  MARY: *basta.*
   enough.

2  (1.4)
3  JOHN: *dove sta sonia?*
   where is sonia?

4  (0.7)
5  MARY: *mh? (.) h ha ha (0.4) non lo so.*
   *not it (i)know.*
   *i don’t know.*

6  (1.2)
7  [((Mary opens the door, turns to face the hallway))]
8  [((then turns to the meeting room again))]

9  MARY:  ↑sonia:? ((singing voice))
10  (5.0)
The transcript picks up when Mary goes back to the office after searching in vain for their teacher (Sonia) who was waiting in the hallway during the planning session. Once she is back in the room, Mary marks the end of the planning session with the Italian word *basta* (“enough”, line 1). As demonstrated in the following lines, Mary’s use of Italian in line 1 is an instance of *medium switch* (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002); i.e., a specific type of CS that leads to a switch of the interactional medium (for an example see Chapter 2, subsection 2.3.4, Figure 2.23). After Mary’s turn in Italian, in fact, John resorts to Italian to ask where their teacher is (*dove sta Sonia?*, “where is Sonia?”, line 3). Mary does not reply right away (line 4) and initiates repair on John’s question with the token *mh?* (line...
5), possibly indicating a problem in understanding. She then laughs briefly\textsuperscript{118} and responds with a no-knowledge claim (\textit{non lo so}, “I don’t know”, line 5). Subsequently, in the following 1.2 seconds (line 6), Mary opens the door, turns to face the hallway, then turns to their room again (lines 7-8) and, with a singing voice, playfully pretends to be summoning their teacher (line 9). That is, she interprets John’s question in line 3 as a request to fetch the teacher\textsuperscript{119}.

After a long pause (line 10), John switches to English to comment on the session, which was \textit{entirely} conducted in their L1 (line 11). Mary responds by nodding (line 13) and laughing (line 14). John then manifests his concern about the usefulness of their meeting for the teacher/researcher: \textit{so i hope that helps:} (line 15).\textsuperscript{120} With his turn John suggests that the predominant use of English may not be helpful. Mary affiliates with this stance with \textit{yeah} (line 17) and proposes, in Italian, the exclusive use of their L2 in their next meeting (\textit{nel prossimo: ... tutto italiano(h)}, “in the next (meeting) ... all Italian”, lines 19 and 22): a laughable proposal (see the laughter tokens in line 22), which nevertheless meets with John’s agreement when he says: \textit{SÌ. NO: inglese} (“yes. no English”, lines 23 and 25). This contrasts with Lucy’s disagreement, done in English: \textit{that’s what you think} (line 29).

In summary, this fragment has shown how Italian is used to mark the end of an interaction mostly conducted in the participants’ L1. With a subsequent switch to English, two students comment on that interaction and on its usefulness for the

\textsuperscript{118} It is hard to interpret the reason of Mary’s laughter. It might be related to the use of Italian as the language for the current interaction and/or to the fact that Mary does not understand his question right away.

\textsuperscript{119} I thank Andrea Golato for this observation.

\textsuperscript{120} In the consent form signed before data collection, the participants were informed that the present study aimed to get a better understanding of the language learning process by looking at the learners’ interaction during classroom-related tasks.
teacher/researcher. These same participants switch back to Italian to propose the exclusive use of their L2 in the next planning session. The one participant who rejects this proposal does so in English. The two languages, thus, are cleverly used in alternation for discourse-related purposes. Specifically, in talking about past and future interactions, the participants use the language that was or could be used in those interactions. Furthermore, Figure 5.38\footnote{In this dataset, there are other moments when the participants in group A interact in Italian. However, this happens when the interlocutors are L1 speakers of Italian; i.e., their teacher and another TA that drops by to greet them. Since the focus of this chapter is on the language used in student-student interactions, those moments are not analyzed here.} clearly demonstrates that these students can actually communicate with each other in Italian. This observation leads to conclude that the local interactional order that almost exclusively limits the use of Italian for the planning outcome is not necessarily due to the participants’ low proficiency in this language.

### 5.9 Summary of findings

This chapter aimed at developing an emic and sequential account of the patterns of language alternation enacted by groups of students engaged in planning a classroom presentation. The analytical work conducted here is grounded in CA’s methodological and theoretical framework. Furthermore, this study has been inspired by the dual goal of exploring: (a) CA’s potential in the investigation of language learning environments, and (b) the insights that can be gained by adopting an interactional perspective in the analysis of language alternation and CS. I therefore carried out detailed CA analyses of instances of language alternation in their specific sequential environment (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004), in order to establish their actual function. In doing so, I adopted Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) definition of CS as an instance of interactional otherness (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002) that is oriented to by the coparticipants as being functional and thus not...
needing repair. Furthermore, within the line of research inspired by Gafaranga’s work, I have also followed Cromdal (2005) in attempting to describe the local interactional order enacted by the participants and instances of deviations from it.

Overall, when engaged in planning work, the participants in the present study achieved and maintained a local interactional order embodied in the distinction between process and product, with the process typically done in L1 English and the product expressed in L2 Italian. This is indeed the most massively frequent pattern of language alternation identified in my data and it represents a clear example of language alternation used as a structuring device, to organize the actions that the participants perform in and through talk-in-interaction. Specifically, in the planning sessions, Italian is used to formulate script lines and questions to post on Facebook and to rehearse the presentation (either by reading a written script or by “winging” their presentations). On the other hand, English is employed to do planning talk; i.e., to manage the task (by negotiating and ratifying various versions of the plan) and to do language work (by stating one’s epistemic stance on the accuracy of certain expressions, by engaging in translation, and by involving the coparticipants in solving searches and other matters).

The first kind of deviation from the local interactional order is represented by those cases in which English is used as a temporary language of the product and Italian as a temporary language of the process. The L1 may momentarily convey the product when a linguistic artifact emerges for the first time (see subsection 5.6.4.1) or when, upon encountering trouble with the formulation in the L2, a participant resorts to English to express either one single item or a whole sentence (see section 5.6.4.2). What is crucial, though, is that these cases are typically instances of medium repair: the use of the L1 to
convey the product is oriented to by the participants as an action needing repair; thus, the
students immediately orient to finding the Italian equivalent. On the other hand, a
different situation occurs when the participants employ indeterminate English
expressions as temporary substitutes for the focus of the sentence (see section 5.6.4.3). In
this case, the use of the L1 characterizes the current version of the script line as not
definitive and the plan it conveys as not fully fledged.

At the same time, Italian is used for the planning process in three different cases.
First of all, the process is done in Italian when the participants conduct individual or
collaborative repair work on the linguistic artifact they are producing, thereby repairing
Italian with Italian (as shown in sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2). Second, the participants
sometimes mark the end of complex collaborative work on a script line with the Italian
agreement token *sì* (“yes”). This action typically co-occurs with the action of writing the
version on which the participants have finally agreed on (see section 5.6.5.1). Quite
interestingly, this practice is enacted only by the students in groups A and B, who carry
out a lot of collaborative work in shaping the script lines for their presentations. Finally,
there is only one instance in the entire dataset where Italian is used to other-direct a
search (see section 5.6.5.2); in the specific sequential environment where this occurs the
use of Italian is an actual codeswitch that is used to meet local interactional purposes.

Overall, a detailed analysis of the process versus product distinction reveals the
complexity of the individual and collaborative work performed by the students on the
emergent linguistic artifacts. English and Italian are employed as semiotic resources that
allow the coparticipants to propose and negotiate temporary and alternative formulations
of the plan until they finally reach an agreement, which is ultimately sealed by the action
of writing. Moreover, by examining how the students work on their linguistic artifacts, it is possible to identify various practices that indicate the students’ conceptualization of the interplay between the L1 and the L2. Specifically, the participants may engage in a collaborative simplification of formulations in the L1 to be later translated into comprehensible Italian (see section 5.7.1), and they may resort to the practice of (re)translation into their L1 in order to verify the meaning of L2 expressions or the morpho-syntactic accuracy of an artifact in the L2 (see sections 5.7.2 and 5.7.3). The practice of translation into the L1 may also be a useful tool when the participants are jogging their memory with respect to the content of their presentation (section 5.7.4).

However, under specific circumstances, the students do not use the languages in their repertoire only to mark the process versus product distinction; moreover, when they deviate from the normative interactional order, it is not just to index the temporariness of English as language of the product or of Italian as language of the process. The participants in fact also enact actual codeswitches for discourse related purposes and with specific interactional functions. For example, they use Italian to mark the beginning or the end of a session (see section 5.8.3) or they express in Italian an action that was previously performed in English. More precisely, the participants may employ Italian to reissue assessments in order to extend humorous moments in the face of competing courses of action (see section 5.8.1) and also to redo the same action when a coparticipant is not showing any uptake (see section 5.8.2).

As various researchers (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011; Cromdal, 2005; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2005; Kasper, 2004; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Zentella, 1997) have observed, language alternation is a powerful resource that allows the
participants either “to up the stakes” (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011, p. 328) or to mitigate an action. Language alternation is an extra rhetorical device that L2 speakers can use to perform actions otherwise conveyed in different ways. As Zentella (1997) says: “what monolinguals accomplish by repeating louder and/or slower, or with a change of wording, bilinguals can accomplish by switching languages” (p. 96).

Previous research conducted within the interactional perspective (Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Fuller, 2009; Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2005; Mori, 2004) showed that, in L2 classrooms, regardless of whether L1 use is permitted, tolerated or banned, (a) L2 learners alternate between the L1 and the L2; (b) they do so both for discourse-related and participant-related purposes; and (c) switches to the L1 do not necessarily reflect a lack of proficiency in the L2.

The present study shifted the focus to a setting where the students are explicitly allowed to use the L1 while engaged in classroom-related tasks (as in Cromdal, 2005). Overall, this study confirms and expands previous findings in that it shows how L2 learners codeswitch for a variety of discourse-related purposes, using language alternation as a structuring device that mainly allows them to: (i) contrast the formulations that will be used in the final task with the talk used for task planning; (ii) mark an orientation to different courses of action, therefore establishing sequential boundaries.

Moreover, students at different proficiency levels employ similar patterns of language alternation and CS. This finding constitutes yet another piece of evidence that demonstrates how alternating between two languages is not a sign of deficiency, but an actual discursive skill and an important interactional tool. In fact, it allows the
participants to organize their interaction in particular ways and to perform (and recognize) specific actions.

Furthermore, a close analysis of L2 use has shown how the participants orient to the linguistic accuracy and comprehensibility of the planning product during the planning process. As for L1 use, the L1 as language of the process is once again shown to have important functions in aiding task management and in doing language work. Specifically, an exploration of the interplay between the L1 and the L2 has demonstrated how the L1 may be oriented to as a term of comparison to determine the morpho-syntactic and lexical accuracy of the L2 and its comprehensibility. The L1, in fact, may work as a baseline to establish whether the formulations in the L2 will be accurate, easy to say, or easy to understand, and is therefore crucial in the collaborative co-construction of the L2 script lines to be performed in the final task.

In conclusion, this chapter has demonstrated the importance of grounding the analysis in the details of the unfolding interaction, in order to understand – from an emic perspective – how the participants alternate between the languages in their repertoire and what they sequentially accomplish with this practice. Moreover, Gafaranga’s (2000, 2009) terminological framework has proved to be a powerful tool to analyze the participants’ language choices as purposeful social actions in a language learning environment.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Relevance of the study

In line with the call for a process-oriented and ecologically sound approach to planning in SLA (Donato, 1994; Ellis, 2005a; Foster & Skehan, 1999; Kawauchi, 2005; Ortega, 1999, 2005; Sangarun, 2005; Truong & Storch, 2007), and with the behavioral approach adopted in other fields (Murphy, 2004, 2005; Roth, 1996, Suchman, 1987, 2007), the present study contributes to SLA planning research by improving our understanding of group planning as a situated activity enacted by L2 learners in interactions-for-classroom-tasks. To this end, naturally occurring data were analyzed using the research tools afforded by CA, in order to document some of the observable practices in which the students engage when planning a classroom presentation. This empirically grounded approach offers an emic account of how planning is collaboratively achieved in real time in and through embodied talk-in-interaction (see also Markee & Kunitz, 2013).

The analysis has shown that planning sessions are loci of laminated (i.e., accumulative, multimodal) and cooperative human action (Goodwin, 2013), in which specific language learning behaviors may regularly be expected to occur. During planning, the participants use available resources (e.g. paper, pencils, erasers, dictionaries, online sources of information, their own knowledge of English and Italian) to collaboratively construct emergent artifacts. These artifacts – which function as public substrates upon which specific operations (e.g., translation, grammar/vocabulary work, etc.) are performed – constitute mediating tools in the students’ planning and learning work. Moreover, during planning, various patterns of knowledge distribution emerge
among the coparticipants, who negotiate their epistemic stances in order to co-construct more accurate and comprehensible linguistic artifacts in the L2.

Overall, this study demonstrates the kind of insights that can be gained through the analysis of students’ observable, situated practices, and contributes to our understanding of collaborative human action in language learning environments. More specifically, on the basis of the present analysis, group planning can be respecified as an intersubjective, goal-oriented activity that is done by multilingual actors as observable behavior, consisting of a nexus of laminated actions that occur in the moment and over time in and through embodied talk-in-interaction (Kunitz & Markee, 2013).

6.2 Summary of findings
I will now summarize the main findings of the present study. The discussion is organized around five different points: 1) the production of material artifacts; 2) the interactional practices enacted by the students during the planning sessions; 3) the emic criteria oriented to by the participants; 4) patterns of language alternation between L1 English and L2 Italian; 5) proficiency level.

6.2.1 The production of material artifacts
The students produced a variety of material linguistic artifacts. The artifacts differ in terms of the creation process used, the linguistic medium, and their social functions. Some artifacts were created individually, others collaboratively. In terms of the linguistic medium, a few artifacts only emerged orally (e.g., when the students in Italian 310 rehearsed their presentation without looking at their notes). In other cases, some linguistic artifacts (such as script lines and, in a few cases, Facebook questions) emerged orally, were shaped in and through the interaction, and were then written up. And finally,
other artifacts, such as notes and outlines, did not go through the oral stage. Overall, the analysis conducted here has focused on those artifacts that surfaced in the talk and thus functioned as public conversational substrates (Goodwin, 2013), upon which a number of operations was subsequently performed. Before summarizing the type of interactional work done on these artifacts (see section 6.2.2 below), I will briefly describe the types of written artifacts created by the students.

The notes and the Facebook questions are typically the product of an individual effort, and were created either during the planning sessions or at home. Since I do not have all the students’ notes and I did not have access to the Facebook group shared by the American and the Italian students, I cannot comment on these types of artifacts.

The outlines were produced by three groups out of four (groups B, C, D) and were created in and through the participants’ collaborative discussion, but only one student was typically in charge of the writing. The participants did not orient to the accuracy of this product, which is written in English only (groups C and D) or in both English and Italian (group B); thus, no collaborative work was done on the linguistic expressions being used in the outlines.

All the students enrolled in Italian 103 and some of the students in Italian 310 produced detailed written scripts for their presentations. Other 310 students wrote more schematic and less detailed note cards, containing either full sentences with the main gist of each slide, or a mere list of things to say that functioned as a memory aid. Overall, it seems that proficiency level may play a role in the type of artifact the students produce, but the students’ individual preferences are also an important factor. For example, the two most advanced students, Roberta and Lucio, proceeded in different ways. So
Roberta chose to write a very detailed script, while Lucio simply jotted down the main pieces of information he wanted to convey. Clearly, these types of artifacts have different functions, the nature of which depends also on how the students make use of these products. A closer analysis of the data is required, but a preliminary account of the students’ final performance in their presentation suggests that the students in 103 mostly read their scripts and so did the least advanced students in 310. In contrast, the other students seemed to be speaking spontaneously and only occasionally glancing at their scripts/notes, no matter how detailed they were (this is Roberta’s case, for example: she did write a detailed script, but she did not read it). Finally, another element to consider is when the scripts were produced during the planning process. For example, we have seen how Annie (group C) decided to write a script only after “winging” the presentation. From a CA perspective it is not possible to determine the students’ intentions and purposes, unless these are clearly talked into relevance during the planning interaction. Now, there are indeed a few occasions during the planning talk when the participants display their orientation toward the matter of writing/reading a script. For example, in fragments not reported here, the participants in group C topicalize the fact that Kitty was writing a detailed script, while Annie was “winging” her presentation. In this particular case, the discussion revolves around the students’ perception of their individual skills; that is, Kitty accounts for her action of script writing by saying that she is not confident in her speaking skills. On the other hand, during the run-through of the presentation in group D’s third planning session, Lucio negatively comments on the fact that some of his coparticipants were actually reading their scripts. In group D, the line of the argument did not focus on the students’ proficiency level, but on the teacher’s requirements for oral
presentations. Further research should explore these matters; more specifically, on the type of scripts the students produce, the use of these scripts during the presentation, and the emergence of proficiency-related and requirement-related topics in the talk.

6.2.2 Students’ interactional practices during group planning

The analyses presented in Chapters 4 and 5 have shown a variety of interactional practices enacted by the students during the planning sessions. Specifically, the analytical focus was on: (a) the use of HD; (b) repair sequences; (c) translation into the L2; (d) (re)translation into the L1; (e) practices used to finalize agreement.

The script lines developed by the students typically emerged as instances of HD and were preceded by quotative frames. These frames introduced the subsequent lines as more or less assertive proposals and characterized the planning process as either an individual or collective endeavor. The main function of HD seems that of adding evidentiality to the formulation of a plan, which is demonstrated, rather than described. The use of HD allows for a demonstration of topics to include, actions that might be performed, and lines that might actually be used in the script and in the presentation.

In the analysis, I have focused on those instances of HD that were oriented to as actual script lines to perform during the presentation. These lines thus became the object of the students’ language work. If a script line or part of a script line was temporarily conveyed in English, the students subsequently translated it into Italian. Once a line was formulated in Italian, it was subject to modifications performed through repair sequences that were done either individually or collaboratively and that were either backward- or forward-oriented (Schegloff, 1979). The analysis of the trouble sources and the repair
outcomes has shown how all the students oriented to the lexical and grammatical accuracy and sometimes even to the lexical variation of the final written product.

This orientation to accuracy was also manifest in the way the participants resorted to the practice of (re)translating an Italian expression or sentence into their L1, in order to verify its grammatical and lexical accuracy, but also to ensure a shared understanding, to do remembering, and, in some cases, to solicit a response from the coparticipants in the face of a display of uncertainty.

Finally, the activity of collaborative planning requires that agreement is reached among the coparticipants. So, whenever the students performed collaborative work on their artifacts, they employed a variety of verbal and nonverbal displays of assent. In the analysis, I have focused on two specific practices: the use of Italian sì to seal the participants’ agreement after complex repair sequences, and the action of writing the agreed on version of the emergent artifact as a final form of ratification.

6.2.3 The participants’ emic criteria

A CA account of the emergence and unfolding development of linguistic artifacts reveals the emic criteria to which the students orient. Specifically, the participants are concerned with lexical and morpho-syntactic accuracy, and with the comprehensibility of the final product. Furthermore, at least in one case, they appear sensitive to the need for lexical variation. These findings apply to students in all groups, regardless of their proficiency level and whether their presentation was a graded assignment (groups C and D) or not (groups A and B).

Note that lexical accuracy, lexical variation and comprehensibility all figure among the teachers’ grading criteria for oral presentations (see Chapter 3, section 3.4),
whereas morpho-syntactic accuracy is not explicitly mentioned in the grade components. The rationale, in fact, is that – since the presentation is an oral task – expectations regarding oral morpho-syntactic accuracy should not be the same as for written morpho-syntactic accuracy. At the same time, morpho-syntactic accuracy is indirectly graded through the comprehensibility component of the grade; if the language used in the presentation is totally inaccurate, it will not be comprehensible either. However, the analysis clearly shows that the participants did orient to the morpho-syntactic accuracy of the L2. This is manifest in the practices of self- and other-repair (when an artifact goes through a series of attempted formulations until an accurate version is finally produced and agreed upon) and in the practice of (re)translation into the L1 (when the students verify the accuracy of an Italian sentence by checking it against the structure of the corresponding English sentence). Hence, there appears to be a difference between the teachers’ grading criteria and the students’ emic criteria in considering how a presentation should be done. This difference may be due to a different conceptualization of the final task. In fact, whereas the teachers conceive presentations as an oral endeavor, for the participants presentations have an important written element, as demonstrated by their collaborative work on L2 script lines.

Three observations are thus in order. First of all, the students’ orientation to linguistic accuracy in writing matches the teachers’ concern with it in written tests. Second, it is the orientation to the written modality itself that may have triggered the students’ concern for morpho-syntactic accuracy. As Storch (2011) points out, being less ephemeral than speaking, “writing is more likely to encourage learners to reflect on their language use” (p. 276; see also: Adams & Ross-Feldman, 2008; Williams, 2008).
Similarly, Ortega (2005, pp. 104-105) has found that the students’ attention to form was ultimately supported by the opportunity to write notes. This issue has been discussed by cognitivist scientists as well. For example, here is what Kirsh (2006) has to say on the matter:

> When a person writes on paper, the two form a reciprocal system. The person causes paper changes, paper changes partially cause person changes. This reciprocal interaction allows the person to find expressions, to represent and explore ideas using the persistent state of the paper that would otherwise be impossible. There is a dynamic between the two. (pp. 250-251).

The cases of “noticing in writing” illustrated in the analysis speak to this issue. As they engage in the process of writing or while looking at a written form, the participants orient to certain expressions as trouble sources and initiate repair on them (on this matter see also: Kääntä, 2013). It may well be the material visibility of these forms that makes them more salient and therefore particularly subject to possible modification. A detailed CA analysis of a collection of similar cases could contribute to current quantitative, psycholinguistic studies on this matter, by providing a behavioral respecification of noticing in writing as a nexus of observable actions.

Third, the students’ orientation to accuracy may be related to the fact that they were doing collaborative writing. As previous studies have shown, it seems that students engaged in collaborative work produce more accurate texts (Storch, 2005; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009) than students who work individually. Moreover, peer collaboration in writing seems to foster depth of attention and engagement with language work (Storch, 2008; Tocalli-Beller & Swain, 2005) and it may ultimately lead to language learning
6.2.4 Patterns of language alternation between L1 English and L2 Italian

Previous research on language alternation has mainly focused on the functions of L1 use in the L2 classroom, where maximum use of the L2 is typically advised if not enforced. My dissertation has looked at a different environment; i.e., at a setting where students – while still performing classroom-related tasks – are free to interact in whichever language they choose. Within this environment I have looked at patterns of language alternation and, specifically, at how the L2 is used.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the students co-constructed an interactional order where Italian, the L2, conveyed the planning product. Italian was only used to carry out the planning process on a few occasions. This happened when the students repaired Italian with Italian, and when they marked the end of complex collaborative sequences with the use of sì. In only one case was Italian used to other-direct a search. At the same time, Italian was used beyond the process versus product distinction, to mark the orientation to different (and possibly competing) courses of action. In the data there are also observable cases of actual CS, for example when Italian marks the beginning or the end of a session or when it is used to reissue actions previously performed in English, sometimes with a humorous function.

On the other hand, the present study has confirmed previous findings (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Cromdal, 2005; Fuller, 2009; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Wannagat, 2007) regarding the use of the L1, which proved to be essential
in doing the planning talk through which the task was managed and completed. Finally, this dissertation has also shown how the students conceptualized the interplay between the L1 and the L2, by using the L1 as a baseline to determine the accuracy and the comprehensibility of L2 formulations.

6.2.5 Proficiency level

Overall, it seems that the different proficiency levels of the 103 and the 310 students did not play a role in terms of the language alternation patterns that were observed, nor in the students’ orientation to L2 accuracy. This suggests that all the students, regardless of their proficiency level, organized their work similarly, by creating a local interactional order that allowed them to recognize their actions and to interpret deviations from the locally established norm. Specifically, all the students employed a bilingual medium of interaction that was locally organized so that Italian was used as language of the product and English as language of the process. Moreover, they all displayed a concern for accuracy, which – as mentioned above – was particularly evident when the students were collaboratively engaged in writing. These findings mean neither that the difference in proficiency level among these students is negligible nor that the students’ overall proficiency level is low (given the limited use of Italian beyond the process versus product distinction). They simply indicate that the participants’ different proficiency level did not impact the way they resourcefully employed the two shared languages in their repertoire.

6.3 Pedagogical implications

Overall, these findings speak to the distinction between task-as-plan and task-as-activity (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Hellermann & Pekarek Doeleher, 2010; Markee & Kasper,
In their moment-by-moment achievement of the task as an activity, students are “active agents” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496) who have their own goals and act accordingly. The present work provides further evidence to the idea that tasks shouldn’t be conceptualized as predetermined fixed entities, since tasks “are configured by the learner’s own activities and interpretation processes” (Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler, 2004, p. 505). It is therefore crucial to examine “tasks-in-progress as joint ongoing accomplishments” (Kasper, 2006, p. 93).

As this study has demonstrated, there may be important differences between the students’ and the teachers’ conceptualizations of the final task. What is needed, then, is an investigation of “the variable relationship between the task designers’ intentions and the learners’ interpretations of the tasks assigned to them” (Mori, 2002, p. 324); i.e., an investigation that would explore the complex relation not only between teachers’ instructions and students’ outcomes, but also between process(es) and product(s) of task planning. The findings of this line of research would broaden our understanding of the “relation between the activity of planning and the conduct of actions-according-to-plan” (Suchman, 2007, p. 21) and would ultimately be beneficial to our understanding of the role of planning in classroom-related tasks.

The findings of this study lead to two main pedagogical conclusions. First of all, they suggest that teachers should be as informed as possible about their students’ practices, about the emic criteria they orient to (i.e., accuracy, comprehensibility, etc.), and about their interpretations of the planning activity and the final task. For example, for most of the students in the present dataset, the ultimate goal of planning is the
(individual or collective) production of a written script. This in turn reveals how the students interpret the final task (i.e., the classroom presentation) as crucially based on the written artifact created during planning time. This interpretation, though, is in contrast with the teachers’ conceptualization of classroom presentations as oral tasks (and with the evaluation criteria established accordingly). As Truong and Storch (2007, p. 104) point out, oral presentations constitute a rather challenging task, since they involve online language processing and an element of performance. As such, they are very different from writing tasks, which allow for the possibility of revising and editing one’s text.

What happens, though, if the students insert a crucial written component in the preparation for oral presentations? Only two solutions seem possible: once teachers are informed about the students’ planning practices and about their interpretation of the task, either they change the grading criteria (because, after all, the students are performing a different task) or they set out to intervene in the planning process, by providing guidance and redirecting students’ practices and interpretations, so that the students produce a planning outcome that actually meets the teachers’ expectations and the syllabus requirements. Now, it is not feasible for most teachers to conduct the type of time-consuming empirical investigation carried out here. But, at least in the institutional context where the present data were collected, the main pedagogical implication of this study would be to have students plan in the classroom, where they can be observed, be given feedback on their planning as it occurs, and be assessed on the actual final product that they are constructing. Specifically, in the data analyzed here, the final product turns out to be a highly complex, longitudinal, laminated (i.e., written-oral) genre, constructed through a variety of resources and embodied interactional practices (among which
translation plays a major role. Moreover, by bringing the students’ planning work into the classroom, the teachers would also be able to monitor the transitory artifacts produced by the students and to gain an understanding of what the students intend to do.

At the same time, the teachers might redirect the students’ planning practices. For example, in line with previous findings in different research traditions (see for example: Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Hellermann & Pekarek-Doehler, 2010; Ortega, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 2000), the present study has shown how students heavily rely on the practices of translation from the L1 and (re)translation into the L1. No matter what research says on the effectiveness of these practices, that is what the students do. So, rather than authoritatively enforcing a strict L2-only policy, it would perhaps be more useful to discuss with students the pros and cons of relying heavily on their L1 and on (re)translation practices in the planning process. Such a pedagogical choice would meet the goal of making students more independent, more aware of their learning process and of the learning behaviors that could foster it (see for example the line of research on learning strategy training: Dickinson, 1992; Oxford, 1990).

The pedagogical usefulness of the teachers’ intervention during planning has also been invoked by researchers operating within the classical SLA tradition (Foster & Skehan, 1999; Sangarun, 2005). These researchers come to such a conclusion by considering the better linguistic quality of the final product obtained by students who are guided in their planning by their teacher (Foster & Skehan, 1999) and by well-formulated instructions (Sangarun, 2005). However, evidence of the students’ compliance with the instructions is either not provided (Foster & Skehan, 1999) or given by the students’ comments in plan-aloud protocols and answers to a post-task interview (Sangarun, 2005).
In contrast, in the present study, the suggestion that the teacher should contemplate the possibility of intervening during planning emerges from and is grounded on an empirical account of what students observably do when they plan, and on the observation that what students come up with differs from the teacher’s expectations illustrated in the syllabus. In other words, rather than assuming that the students follow the instructions they receive and therefore produce a better final product (if this is indeed what happens)\textsuperscript{122}, it is important to make sure that the students actually follow the instructions they are given and that their performance is assessed with the appropriate grading criteria (i.e., with criteria specifically formulated for the activity being accomplished and the outcome being produced). Ultimately, whether the instructions and the students’ implementation of the instructions are conducive to better linguistic products is an empirical question and needs to be verified accordingly.

The second pedagogical conclusion concerns a reconsideration of the product-based assessment procedures that are currently in use. In fact, this study suggests that the product alone (i.e., the written script and the presentation based on it) does not necessarily reveal the students’ emic criteria and is not sufficient to assess whether learning happened and how. After all, an inaccurate final product does not mean that the students do not orient to accuracy and/or that no learning behavior has occurred. This observation is certainly not new in education. For example, Roth (1996) points out that “learning is only partially reflected in the artifacts that result from the design process and which are traditionally the sole basis for the evaluation of learning” (p. 130). Similarly,

\textsuperscript{122} Unpublished evidence by Markee (personal communication) suggests that the students’ actual performance is sometimes much more sophisticated than what is predicted or required by a specific set of pedagogical instructions.
Breen (1989) wonders: “The task-in-process and the teaching and learning activity will intervene between the pre-designed task and actual learning outcomes. Perhaps, therefore, evaluative effort would gain greater reward if it was directed upon the task-in-process?” (p. 189). Hence it seems that the incorporation of a process-oriented element in current product-based assessment procedures would be in order in the language classroom, at least in formative classroom-based assessment, which aims at “gathering useful information that the teacher can use to support student language learning” (Rea-Dickins, 2000, p. 384).

6.4 Directions for future research

The descriptive and exploratory study carried out here is a preliminary process-oriented exploration of students’ planning practices which probably raises more questions about planning than it answers. So far I have identified two lines of research that could be pursued. First, a further CA-oriented exploration of students’ verbal and embodied practices could focus specifically on: (a) the development of presentation topics; (b) agreement practices; (c) off-task talk; (d) mimetic pre-enactments; and (e) pointing gestures in agreeing environments (section 6.4.1). A second line of research could be motivated by a pedagogical rationale (section 6.4.2).

6.4.1 CA research on students’ practices

The present study has been mainly concerned with the type of language work that the students carry out on their linguistic artifacts. It would also be interesting, however, to see how the ideas for presentation topics develop both within the same planning session and across different planning sessions. This line of inquiry could draw on Sahlström’s
As we have seen, a fundamental requisite in the planning process is the achievement of agreement among the coparticipants. In this study, however, I have only analyzed in detail the cases when the students use Italian *sì* as a token that seals their final agreement on a proposed version of the plan. It would thus make sense to compare sequences where *sì* is used to sequences where agreement is sealed by other tokens or expressions (e.g., *okay* and *yeah*) and to explore what the use of *sì* actually accomplishes. At the same time, it would be interesting to see whether there are differences in the way agreement is done, depending on the position of the agreeing turn in the sequence, whether it conveys assent on a temporary proposal or a final solution.

Another line of research that would be worth pursuing concerns off-task talk (on this topic, see: Markee, 2005). Such an interest emerges from the empirical observation that the students participating in this study often engage in off-task talk. The videos show how the students talk about a variety of topics, so that the planning sessions turn out to be speech events ‘populated’ with stories and asides of all sorts. One could then look at emerging themes of off-task talk. At the same time, from a more sequential perspective, one could investigate how the students initiate off-task talk and how the relevance of on-task talk is re-instantiated by the coparticipants.

A second line of inquiry would pursue the analysis of the participants’ embodied practices, focusing in particular on mimetic pre-enactments and on the use of pointing gestures in agreeing environments. The investigation of these practices is suggested by a close analysis of group A’s video recordings, where a few instances of these practices
have been identified. Mimetic pre-enactments are prospective gestural representations of nonverbal actions that might be performed in a hypothetical situation (on mimetic enactments see: Sidnell, 2006; Streeck, 2009). They can accompany proposals about the content and the structure of the presentation and they seem to be related to the theatrical nature of the presentation-as-performance.

On the other hand, students have been observed to do pointing gestures in agreeing environments (on pointing see: Goodwin 1994, 2003; Streeck 2009). These gestures seem to occur in four different situations: (i) a participant’s pointing gesture occurs simultaneously with a coparticipant’s talk (specifically, the point seems to isolate the part of the speaker's talk on which the recipient is about to display her agreement); (ii) the pointing gesture accompanies the delivery of an acknowledgment/agreement token (e.g., yeah, yes, mh mh); (iii) the pointing gesture accompanies the delivery of an agreeing expression containing a deictic (e.g., that's true); (d) the pointing gesture accompanies a repeat of the item on which the current speaker agrees.

6.4.2 Classroom research with a pedagogical rationale

The present study has focused on the planning processes. The next step would be a more detailed exploration of the material artifacts that have been produced and an analysis of the students’ performance during their presentation (more specifically, how they performed and how they were/could be assessed). In other words, following Suchman (2007), future research needs to investigate the intricate relation between process(es) and product(s) in task planning through “an account of the relation between planning-as-activity, the artifacts of that activity, and the subsequent activities to which those artifacts (conceptual, linguistic, or otherwise) are meaningfully related” (p. 20). It is only through
an understanding of all the components in task planning and performance (i.e., teacher’s instructions, planning process, planning outcome, grading) that we can have a more complete picture of the process of transformation from task-as-workplan to task-as-activity and of its pedagogical implications.

As mentioned in section 6.3, the findings of this study lead to two pedagogical conclusions, related to the teacher’s intervention during planning and to process-based assessment. Future research could pursue these lines of inquiry. First of all, one could observe what happens when the planning process is brought into the classroom: how the teacher orients to it, how she intervenes, and whether such an intervention affects task planning and the students’ final performance.

Related to this line of inquiry is the investigation on planning foci, which has been addressed in a number of previous studies (see for example: Foster & Skehan, 1999; Ortega, 2005; Sangarun, 2005; Truong & Storch, 2007). Foster and Skehan (1999) and Sangarun (2005) have manipulated focus on form and focus on meaning from the outset, by giving different instructions to different students; Ortega (2005) examined the students’ report on their planning foci, while Truong and Storch (2007) coded students’ planning talk for language related episodes and idea units. However, no research has been conducted so far on the interface between focus on form and focus on content as it emerges in the students’ talk-in-interaction, specifically when the students are planning tasks that are inserted into a content-based curriculum. It would thus be interesting to investigate whether the teacher’s intervention can guide the students’ focus on planning in order to achieve a balance between form and content in content-based classes (Lyster, 2007; Lyster and Mori, 2008).
Finally, regarding assessment, it would be useful to collect more data and focus on the planning of tasks subject to assessment (in the present dataset, only groups C and D were planning a task that was going to be graded) to see: (i) how learners interpret tasks in high stakes testing situations; (ii) which criteria they orient to during planning and task performance; and (iii) whether students’ interpretations and criteria correspond to testers’ conceptualizations of the tasks and to the grading criteria developed to assess student success. The kind of research I propose is in line with current work on dynamic assessment (Anton, 2009) and assessment for learning (Shepard, 2000), which aim at the integration of instruction and assessment. Assessment for learning in particular seems well suited as a form of classroom-based assessment embedded in the teaching and learning context. Such an approach can be applied to any classroom, ranging from the math and science classroom to the language classroom. What my research perspective and assessment for learning crucially share is the double focus on both learning processes and products, so that an assessment of the ongoing learning processes (enacted through specific practices) can allow teachers and students to take principled action and can eventually affect the learning outcome (see Amerine & Bilmes, 1988 for a foundational study in this area).

In conclusion, the type of conversation analytic, process-oriented research used in this dissertation can inform our general understanding of group planning in the field of second language studies, by focusing on the social and laminated nature of planning practices in language learning environments, and by suggesting pedagogical implications for the teacher’s role and assessment procedures in the second language classroom.
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