

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Jakonen, Teppo

Title: The environment of a bilingual classroom as an interactional resource

Year: 2018

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Jakonen, T. (2018). The environment of a bilingual classroom as an interactional resource. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 20-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.09.005>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

**THE ENVIRONMENT OF A BILINGUAL CLASSROOM AS AN
INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE**

Accepted for publication in *Linguistics and Education* (part of Special Issue,
Studying the visual and material dimensions of education and learning, edited by
P. Laihonen & T. P. Szabó)

Teppo Jakonen

Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

THE ENVIRONMENT OF A BILINGUAL CLASSROOM AS AN INTERACTIONAL RESOURCE

ABSTRACT

Both schoolscape studies and recent conversation analytic (CA) research on classroom interaction have demonstrated that material artefacts such as images, texts and different kinds of objects that are found in classrooms have a significant role in the educational practice. This article turns the spotlight on social action within a bilingual classroom, exploring how participants visibly orient to the surrounding material environment during instructional interaction. The data consist of video-recorded lessons from secondary-level education. A multimodal conversation analytic investigation focuses on instructional interactions during which participants attend to classroom texts and semiotic objects in ways that foreground language and content-related ideologies. Sequential analyses of selected data extracts aim to show the occasioned nature of classroom objects and some ways in which instructional practices both draw on and modify the already existing visual and textual environment. To conclude, the article reflects on the use of an interactional research methodology in schoolscape studies.

(Keywords: learning environment, schoolscape, objects in interaction, classroom interaction, conversation analysis, bilingual education)

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent research on language and education, there has been increasing interest in the material practices of educational spaces. This interest has not only been articulated within the emerging research area of schoolscape, that is, the visual and material features of educational spaces (see e.g. Brown, 2012; Szabó, 2015), but it has also figured prominently in investigations of how (L2) learning materials are used in classroom interaction (Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2013; Jakonen, 2015; Kunitz, 2015; Tainio, 2012). While these lines of inquiry share a conviction that the

material environment is an important aspect of language education, they also have substantially different research foci. Put briefly, the work on schoolscape has its roots in research on linguistic landscapes and addresses the multimodal semiotics of public signage, focusing its investigation mainly on how such materials create and transmit language ideologies but also on how they construct specific literacy genres (for the latter, see e.g. Hanauer, 2009). On the other hand, the typical object of inquiry for conversation analytic (CA) studies of classroom interaction is social interaction itself, and, as far as (learning) materials are concerned, these studies are primarily interested in how they are used as resources for interaction in the local context of some sequentially-evolving activities.

In this article, I attempt to bring these two domains of inquiry together to explore the schoolscape of a bilingual classroom as a material and semiotic structure that can be attended to, drawn on and made sense of in social interaction in a classroom. More specifically, I will not do what many prior schoolscape studies have already done, that is, examine classroom texts and images in and of themselves, but will instead focus the analysis on how such material resources are visibly used, engaged with and modified in classroom interaction for the purposes of providing instruction.

An investigation of the interactional use of classroom objects provides a window into understanding how instruction is shaped by ways of navigating the material environment, being accomplished through work that involves perceiving relevancies between objects *of* and *for* instruction, and making such relevancies visible to students. Doing this addresses two kinds of research gaps in the emerging schoolscape literature. Firstly, as Brown (2012, p. 295) notes,

there is a need for studies that explore “the spoken component of landscapes in addition to their material counterparts”. Moreover, in order to understand the specific role of learning materials in (language) education, there is a need to consider how and when talk, text and objects intersect in routine social encounters in the classroom. Lastly, within research on schoolscales, there is a general lack of studies investigating how the ideologies that appear in texts and other materials are made relevant, received, subverted or otherwise treated by participants themselves in classroom interaction. The contribution of micro-interactional approaches such as CA for the schoolscale literature is that they can highlight the central role of mundane social action as a locus for negotiation about ideology.

The present study addresses these research gaps by exploring schoolscales in interactional use. It draws on a multimodal conversation analytic approach (Deppermann, 2013; Stivers & Sidnell, 2005) to investigate interaction within the material environment of a bilingual classroom, in situations of whole-class teaching where that environment and its objects become observably relevant for the participants. The article describes different kinds of orientations to the material environment and proposes some ways in which key aspects of the schoolscale – the constitution, (re)production and transformation of ideology – could be examined as interactional phenomena. ‘Ideology’ is a notoriously complex term that has received a tremendous amount of attention in prior linguistic and anthropological literature (for an overview, see e.g. Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994), and this study does not aim to provide a comprehensive account of it. Rather, ‘ideology’ is approached in a data-driven manner with the relatively simple working definition as presumptions about languages, their speakers and other kinds of groups of people. Finally, an additional aim of this paper is to reflect upon the use of interactional methodologies for

schoolscape studies and to suggest some ways in which the analysis of social interaction could be integrated in schoolscape studies.

2. THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM AS A MATERIAL ENVIRONMENT, ITS OBJECTS, AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

The term ‘schoolscape’ refers broadly to the “visual and spatial organization of educational spaces” and directs scholarly attention on the “inscriptions and images and the arrangement of the furniture” (Szabó, 2015, p. 24) found in different places within school buildings. A key aspect of the investigation of schoolscales is the idea that that which is visually available to participants also constructs and transmits particular language ideologies. The central role of ideology can be seen in Brown’s (2012, p. 282) definition for the schoolscape:

the school-based environment where place and text, both written (graphic) and oral, **constitute, reproduce, and transform** language ideologies. Schoolscales project ideas and messages about what is officially sanctioned and socially supported within the school. (Brown 2012, p. 282, emphasis added)

It is interesting, firstly, that the definition above adopts a broad understanding of text, subsuming under it both written and spoken language. Despite this, existing studies of schoolscales – and more generally of linguistic landscapes – have tended to focus the investigation on the written texts and graphic images found in (educational) spaces as opposed to participants’ spoken language and social interaction. It could be argued that this also has consequences for identifying who or what function as *agents* of the work of reproduction and transformation of language ideologies. In Brown’s definition above, for example, this is reflected in what could be termed as at least a partial erasure of human agency, visible in how ‘places’ and ‘texts’ (as opposed to

individuals) are the agents that do such ideological work. Furthermore, ideology becomes visible in the distribution of languages and the relative prominence that different languages – majority, minority, regional, etc. – occupy within the schoolscape.

Spaces such as classrooms tend to be semiotically rich environments where participants quite routinely point at, talk about and handle different kinds of texts, objects and technological tools. Texts, inscriptions and images of the schoolscape can themselves have different temporalities, which Brown (2012, pp. 289–290) refers to with a distinction between temporary (or dynamic) and long-term schoolsapes. Some texts are clearly long-term features in classrooms, and for example posters or charts may be hung on classroom walls for the whole school year or even longer. On the other hand, some classroom texts such as those found on the blackboard are typically under constant modification, old ones being routinely erased and replaced with new text (e.g. Greiffenhagen, 2014). If we extend this thinking to the role of objects in social interaction in more general, a related distinction can be made between objects that are used as situated resources for doing some action and objects that are themselves practical accomplishments in that they emerge as a result of some social interaction (see e.g. Nevile, Haddington, Heinemann, & Rauniomaa, 2014).

In principle, any object can serve as a situated resource for social action, in the sense that it can be used to formulate actions such as questions or directives, as well as support the accomplishment of broader activities such as task instructions or explanations, and the like. Besides the chalk and the blackboard, resources that are typically found in classrooms include learning materials such as written textbooks, interactive whiteboards, tablets and laboratory

materials used for scientific experiments, to name just a few everyday material objects. In the specific context of language education, 'learning materials' tends to refer to written documents such as textbooks, for which there is a global (and sometimes criticised) industry, worksheets and other texts that teachers produce for their specific purposes. Much of the existing research on language learning materials has focused on their design, and as Guerrettaz and Johnston (2013) note, there is, overall, a research gap in exploring how learning materials such as textbooks are treated in the social interaction of language classrooms.

However, the material nature of instruction and learning has been clearly demonstrated by a body of literature that has approached classroom interaction from a multimodal conversation analytic perspective. Taking the activity of explaining as an example, studies by Kupetz (2011) and Evnitskaya (2012) have shown how explanations of a scientific principle in the CLIL classroom can be constructed through skilful handling of different kinds of objects found in the local environment, as a joint endeavour of all present parties. Kupetz's (2011, pp. 126–128) study also demonstrates how drawing a sketch on a transparency, which is in turn shown to the class on an overhead projector, can be an important part of the explanation itself, a resource that is pooled together along with talk, gaze, gesture and classroom objects for the purposes of explaining. Moreover, in the foreign language classroom, explanations are routinely found during written task work, in which context pointing to and manipulating texts such as grammar worksheets can be typical resources for bringing off teacher explanations (Majlesi, 2014). In such a case, the worksheet is also an example of the second kind of interactional object, as, once filled out, it is also the practical accomplishment of interaction and task activity. As the aforementioned suggests, of different schoolscapes, classrooms are perhaps the central place to

observe the production of and engagement with the textual environment, both temporary and longer-term.

Besides teacher-led instruction, different kinds of learning materials are important in task work. Students' talk during task activities is in many ways intertwined with the ways that they manipulate texts or other instructional objects (Ford, 1999; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992; Jakonen, 2015; Kääntä & Piirainen-Marsh, 2013; Szymanski, 2003). Classroom texts such as textbooks, in particular, can heavily frame students' task work so that they become treated as the source where to 'find' information for task answers (see Jakonen, 2016b). In task contexts, it is not uncommon to see texts being treated as having the dual nature of being both a resource for interaction and an object of modification through writing. For example, studies by Markee and Kunitz (2013) and Kunitz (2015) show how students in an Italian as a second language class plan for a future oral presentation by producing written scriptlines – text objects that will remind them what to say and how to say it in the presentation. These objects are not only collaboratively shaped in interaction and written down but they also work as artefacts that support the achievement of the eventual oral presentation.

In sum, previous interactional studies have shown the important role that material objects have in organising participation in the classroom. The material environment of a classroom does not only work as a possible resource for action but it can also be the target of participants' action, typically in and through different kinds of textual practices but also in the instruction of various hands-on activities (Kääntä & Piirainen-Marsh, 2013; Lindwall & Ekström, 2012). This article answers Brown's (2012) call for research on spoken interaction within the material schoolscape

by exploring some ways in which participants in a bilingual history classroom engage orient to texts and other semiotic objects in their material environment during instruction. The empirical analysis focuses on instances of whole-class interaction where such orientations foreground a key component of the schoolscape, (language) ideology. In the preceding sentence, ‘language’ is bracketed off because the specific context of the present study, history teaching through a foreign language, the notion of ideology is a matter that also relates to subject-specific concerns. A significant part of the subject pedagogy is to engage with different viewpoints by ‘stepping into other peoples’ shoes’ (Harris & Foreman-Peck, 2004), and in such a context, understanding and even deconstructing ways of thinking in the past times can be a distinct objective of instruction, as the analysis will also show. By exploring schoolscales in interaction, the study also contributes to an inquiry that focuses on the relationship between the environment, its affordances and social action (Breen, 1989; Gibson, 1979; van Lier, 2004). Key questions guiding this inquiry include how, when and for what purposes the schoolscape is relevant to participants. For this, the study adopts a multimodal CA approach, central principles of which will be introduced in the next section.

3. DATA AND METHOD

3.1 (Multimodal) conversation analysis and the analysis of ideology

The present paper draws on ethnomethodological conversation analysis, CA (for introduction, see e.g. Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2002; ten Have, 2007) and approaches face-to-face social interaction as an embodied phenomenon, which in addition to talk is routinely constructed through assembling together other semiotic resources such as gaze, gesture, pointing and material objects available in the environment (see e.g. Deppermann, 2013; Goodwin, 2000;

Mondada, 2014b; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). CA is a predominantly qualitative, data-driven and micro-analytical approach to studying social interaction, its underlying structures and organisation, as well as the practical methods of reasoning that members draw on to make action understandable and recognisable. CA's intellectual roots can be traced back to social sciences (for a more in-depth account of the origins of CA, see Maynard, 2012).

Central to this study, as well as the study of schoolsapes, are the notions of context, material environment and ideology, which is why a few remarks are in order about how these topics have traditionally been approached from a CA perspective. In CA, context is primarily an 'achieved, local and sequential phenomenon' (Markee, 2015, p. 519) and generally refers to the immediate sequential environment of interaction, the context in which turns-at-talk are produced (Gardner, 2004). Thus, a central assumption in CA is that interactional turns are doubly contextual, i.e. they are both 'context-shaped' and 'context-renewing' (see Heritage, 1984, p. 242). This means that any turn not only relies on the immediately preceding action to render it understandable but at the same time it renews the context for a next turn by projecting some action, for which it thereby provides an interpretative frame. For the participants, looking at the immediate sequential environment of interaction provides a resource, a 'next-turn proof procedure' (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, pp. 728–729), to assess if their turn has been adequately responded to. This organisational property of interaction also provides the analyst a principled means to investigate participant orientations in that which the interactants themselves treat as relevant.

The aforementioned suggests that CA predominantly investigates the ways in which participants use local resources, those offered by talk, the body and the material environment, for

constructing and making sense of action. This is a selective process in the sense that participants do not orient to the entire environment such as ‘the classroom’ and everything in it all the time; rather, their attention shifts between specific aspects and material structures of the environment as they conduct whatever business they attend to. For an investigation of the schoolscape, grounding the analysis on interactional relevance that participants perceivably demonstrate in activity provides a way to see just which aspects of the material environment are ‘meaningful’ to them, and, perhaps more importantly, *how* they are meaningful.

Many researchers are familiar with the difficulties in fully understanding what is going on during classroom activities without access to the material artefacts and the pedagogic tasks which are under the participants’ attention. While such observations testify to the importance of the material foundation of educational practice, for researchers they represent a challenge. Markee and Kunitz (2015, pp. 431–433) outline a position regarding how to deal with this problem in classroom-based (CA) research. Briefly put, they suggest collecting as many of these artefacts as possible and, importantly, integrating them in transcripts of interaction in order to preserve and represent the fundamentally multimodal nature of human action. How exactly this can best be done is perhaps a question to which the answer is still open.

A key focus in the schoolscape inquiry is on ideology within the linguistic environment, which represents a research topic that might perhaps more readily be associated with other research perspectives, such as critical ethnography. Indeed, CA’s somewhat strict focus on the relevance of the local sequential context in examining interaction is sometimes criticised as being unable to account for the role that macro-contextual variables such as social class, race, gender and

sexuality play (see Billig, 1999; Wetherell, 1998). In more recent CA work, ‘ideology’, as taken-for-granted and naturalised cultural knowledge and categories, has been investigated in studies that have explored topics such as gender and sexuality as part of what is sometimes labelled as ‘feminist CA’ (e.g. Kitzinger, 2000, 2005; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2003) and CA literature on language ideologies (e.g. Fukuda, 2015; Laihonon, 2008). The present study could be considered as an exercise in applying a CA approach for an ideology-related investigation. Importantly, the study builds on the traditional CA stance that claims about the work of ideology need to be substantiated by showing its relevance in participants’ observable conduct (see Schegloff, 1997, p. 183).

3.2 Data: context, collection, transcription and analysis

For the empirical analysis, this article draws on video-recorded interactions in content and language integrated (CLIL) history lessons which were taught in English to 14-15-year-old Finnish-speaking students at a lower secondary school in Finland. CLIL is a bilingual instructional approach which involves the teaching of non-language subjects through the medium of a foreign language (for introduction, see e.g. Coyle, 2008). The recorded students had attended English-medium immersion from kindergarten through the age of 12, which was when they left primary school. Their secondary school does not follow any explicit immersion programme, but instead teaches relatively flexibly some curricular content in English to the students with immersion background, one class per age cohort. Similarly, the school also has another class that receives some amount of immersion teaching in Swedish, a language that is also used outside the classroom in the local bilingual area.

The data corpus consists of 16 lessons (55 minutes each), which were recorded with three cameras and multiple audio recorders in one classroom during 2010-2011. These lessons were part of a two-term course, English History, which the school offered for its CLIL students. The course was taught by an experienced Finnish-speaking teacher who is also fluent in English and had also worked in the UK and the US during her career. The elective course was very much a personal initiative by the teacher, the contents of which were not directly regulated by the national or school-level curricula. Instead of using published textbooks, the teacher used internet materials and other English-language history books not primarily intended for schools. As for language policy, both English and Finnish were used in her lessons, so that the teacher would routinely orient to maintaining an English-only classroom whereas the students would typically use English with the teacher and either Finnish or (more rarely) English with their peers (see also Jakonen, 2016a).

Besides recording interaction, the data collection entailed gathering all tasks, assignments and texts that were handed out or otherwise used in teaching. As the data were originally collected for interaction research, textual objects such as posters and images hanging on the walls were not photographed in as close-up manner as is customary in schoolscape research. This means that even if these texts, images and objects are visible on the video, any small print is typically not clearly visible in situations where the video camera is placed further away of the object (as we shall see for example in Extract 1 in section 4). This may be considered a limitation for micro-analysis on the interactional relevance of (textual) objects. On the other hand, it should be noted, that neither are such texts visible for many of the students who are seated further away from

them in the classroom space, a matter which teachers can sometimes attend to by, for example, reading aloud texts on the classroom wall.

An often used analytical practice in CA is to work with collections of specific interactional phenomena in order to identify recursive patterns in the data. The present approach resembles more closely that of the single case technique (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2002, Chapters 4–5), which, arguably, suits better the exploratory strategy that an investigation of schoolscales in interaction necessitates. As the material environment is a relevant part of many kinds of actions and activities, it can be difficult to identify a clear (sequentially limited) phenomenon for the focus, which could be used as a starting point for a collection.

The transcription of talk in the data extracts is based on standard CA conventions, as described by Jefferson (2004). In order to make participants' embodied conduct and relevant material objects and texts that they handle in interaction available to the reader, the transcription of talk has been complemented with multimodal annotations of participants' embodied action (see Mondada, 2014a), video screenshots and images of textual artefacts in a way that shows their temporal relation to talk (see Appendix).

4. ANALYSIS

4.1 Finding objects in the environment to support instruction

The following extract demonstrates the occasioned nature of the schoolscale, exhibiting how a specific object can be searched and found in the environment for the purposes of some on-going activity. It begins as a student is finishing reading aloud a short piece of writing about life in

schools during the Tudor time. Just before the extract, the student has referred to the old practice of cock throwing by mentioning that on ‘Tuesday’, students would take money with them to school for buying a ‘fighting cock’. The extract shows how the teacher reacts to the story by specifying this information in a way that draws on the local multilingual schoolscape. She stands up, leaves her desk and walks to the back of the room, which is also used for religion lessons and thereby happens to have a ‘Christian calendar’ hanging on the wall, a large poster made out of A4-sheets containing information about different religious holidays (see Figure 1.1 for an approximation of the classroom layout and the teacher’s walking trajectory).




Figure 1.1. The teacher’s walk through the classroom.

Extract 1. Shrove Tuesday. (Key: W=walk, H=hand)

```

01 MAT    only a sixteen-day holiday on Christmas. ((READING ALOUD))
02        *(0.9)
          teaW  *stands up and begins to walk->
03 TEA    yeah and this:: erm err (.) (va-) (.)
04        taking money (.) would happen(ed) on Shrove Tuesday

```



```

05      (.)
06      what's ↑Shrove Tuesday in Finnish
07      (2.0)* (0.3)# *(0.5) = (2.8)
      teaW      ->*slows down*slides LF towards left->
      fig          #fig1.2
08      *#what's-
      teaW      *pivots on the LF->
      fig          #fig1.3

```



Figure 1.2



Figure 1.3

```

09      (0.4)*#(0.8) = (1.2)
      teaW      ->*continues to walk towards the back of the room->
      fig          #fig1.4
10      it's ↑on- (.) one day when you have it
11      (0.4)*#(0.4) = (0.8)
      teaH      %points at the back wall->
      fig          #fig1.5

```



Figure 1.4



Figure 1.5

```

12      must be <here?>
13      (1.3)
14      #Sh*ro- this is the one (.) *#Shrove Tues%day
      teaW      *pivots 180 degrees on RF*
      teaH      %circles word on the calendar%
      fig          #fig1.6          #fig1.7

```



Figure 1.6



Figure 1.7

```

15      (0.7)
16      %las%kiais↑tiistai (.) %fastlags%tisdag
        Shrove Tuesday ((Finnish)) (.) Shrove Tuesday ((Swedish))
        teaH %underlines word% %underlines word%
17      *(1.2) * (0.3) = (1.5)
        teaW *walks away*stops and points at the calendar->
18      eller,
        or ((Swedish))
19      (0.4)*(0.9) = (1.3)
        teaW ->*walks away->>
20      >fastis.<
21      (1.5)
22      o↑kay (.) can I have your exercise books please?

```

As the student comes to the end of his extended turn, the teacher stands up and leaves her desk during the silence of line 2. While she is on the move towards the middle of the room, she produces a turn (lines 3-4) that further specifies the information ('this taking money') that the student has just conveyed in his read-aloud. This extra information has to do with clarifying that the cock throwing took place on a particular day, the Shrove Tuesday, instead of being a weekly practice. From this kind of subject matter instruction of history, the teacher then shifts her focus to language instruction and checking understanding, as she queries the L1 translation of Shrove Tuesday from the students (line 6).

No student bids for or self-selects to take a turn to provide an answer during the silence at line 7.

At the beginning of the silence, the teacher is still walking, but as no student response appears

forthcoming, she begins to slow her walk down some 2.0 seconds into the silence, appearing to stop in the middle of the four rightmost desks in the room (see Figure 1.1). However, she then quickly ‘slides’ her left foot noticeably left of her previous trajectory and uses it as a pivot for taking a long step with the right foot to continue her walk between the middle desk row (Figures 1.1-1.4).

This physical change of trajectory also changes the course of the on-going instruction sequence. As the teacher is now weaving her way between the desks, she tells how Shrove Tuesday is on ‘one day’ (line 10). Instead of continuing with a longer explanation, as such a turn-beginning would project, the teacher begins to visibly search something on the back wall. She turns the pen in her hand and points towards the wall while moving closer (line 11), adding an account (‘must be here’) that further makes the search observable to the students. Notice how her move towards the back of the room is indeed discernible, even projectable to the students: many of the students in the closest table either follow the teacher with their gaze or look at the back wall, as seen in Figure 1.5, and one student looks towards the wall as early as Figure 1.4. These student orientations show that the teacher’s manner in which she moves in the room is a resource for the students to anticipate what she will do next.

At line 14, the teacher ‘finds’ the object that she is searching for, an A4-sized trilingual calendar entry for Shrove Tuesday. Approaching it from the right, she pivots on her right foot so that she comes to stop on the left-hand side of the calendar entry, in a position where she can present the document to the class without blocking their views (see Figures 1.6 and 1.7). Having now located the material resource she had been looking for, the teacher proceeds to continue the

instruction by uttering both the Finnish and the (Finland-)Swedish translations for Shrove Tuesday (line 16). While the exact text on the calendar cannot be seen either on the video or by students furthest away, the manner in which the teacher utters the two translations suggests that she reads them aloud in the text; indeed, they are produced as ‘read-aloud’ linguistic items, complete with the action of underlining a segment of the calendar while uttering the words. As the teacher leaves this position, she stops briefly, points at the calendar once more and adds the word ‘fastis’ (*Shrove Tuesday*) while on the move. Notice that this post-sequential addition is done entirely in Swedish, prefaced by the word ‘eller’ (*or*). Curiously enough, ‘fastis’ does not appear to be an existing word in (Finland-)Swedish, although the morpheme *-is* is a typical device for creating new, shortened words. This kind of creative language use is perhaps also signalled by the embodied manner in which ‘fastis’ is produced when having left the calendar, a manner that constructs it as more a personal insight rather than vocabulary that is ‘found’ and read aloud.

In summary, extract 1 shows how an object in the environment can function as a resource for the enactment of a multilingual, or translanguaging pedagogy (Bonacina-Pugh, 2013; Creese & Blackledge, 2010), and thereby a manifestation of an ideology whereby all languages available in the environment can serve as possible resources for action. As the extract demonstrates, even if a resource is not necessarily *a priori* designed to serve the current activity, it can be made to do so; thus, an object designed for religion teaching, yet available in the environment, can be ‘found’ to support a different activity. Interestingly, it seems that the (Finland-)Swedish translation for Shrove Tuesday, which supposedly served the Swedish-immersion students in the school, only becomes mentioned by way of the inclusion of the specific object in the

instructional sequence. This interpretation is supported by both the fact that Swedish language was not a usual part of the course and that Swedish is made a relevant part of the interaction only when the teacher arrives at the calendar. Looking at the teacher's turn at line 6, which is uttered before the movement shift towards the back wall, we can see that it projects that a Finnish translation will in any case be heard, whereas the Swedish translation appears more clearly to be afforded by virtue of it having been written on the calendar.

4.2 Modifying the semantic properties of an object

Besides finding an object in the environment and making structures in it relevant by underlining or pointing, an object can also be altered in the course of instruction. The next extract shows how the teacher modifies a map to assist her students in 'seeing' a geographical pattern in the imperial expansion with the help of an added structure, which in this case is an East-West line created by placing a pencil on top of the map.

Extract 2. Where did the English not go?

```

01 TEA  err (.) the ↑other thing is (0.3)
02 wh- err (.) *I didn't actually
    tea      *picks up the course book and turns page->
03 (0.4)
04 when #saying uh- (.) about this
    fig      #fig2.1
05 .hh the English just went a↓round
06 * (0.4)
    tea      ->*puts the book on the overhead projector->
07 if you notice one interesting feature.*
    tea      ->*
08 #(1.4)
    fig      #fig2.2a/b

```



Figure 2.1

09 **err (0.6) *Canada excluded**
 tea *brings in a pencil on top of the map->
 10 (1.0)
 11 <whe::re> (.) did (.) the *English (0.5) not (0.4) go.
 tea ->*

 12 (1.5)
 13 #look at th- er ↑north of this (0.6) pencil and south of this pencil
 fig #fig2.3



Figure 2.3

14 (1.0)
 15 what can you see.
 16 (2.3)
 17 the English &did not like to go- >yeah?<&
 paa &raises hand&
 18 PAA they didn't go to: (.) err (Nunavut)
 19 (0.5)
 20 the- (0.4) northern parts=
 21 TEA =yeah (.) they didn't (0.3) *cos it's ↑cold*
 tea *points from CAN to RUS and back*
 22 (0.6)
 23 *they w- went there where it's warm
 tea *points from Florida to South America and back->
 24 >nice and warm<*

 tea ->*

The teacher's turn beginning at line 1 is sequentially a so called 'third turn' of an Initiation – Response – Follow-up/Evaluation (IRF/E) sequence (e.g. Mchoul, 1978) in that she follows up, in this case with another question, a previous student response reporting a task answer in a 'round robin' (Mortensen & Hazel, 2011) formatted activity. The prior answer, and the way the question leading to it was framed, suggested that the spread of the British Empire was a matter of

coincidence, of ‘traveling round’, something which the follow-up now seeks to address. In this context, lines 1-5 serve as a preface that signals that what is to come is not progression to next task item, but instead a revisiting of the prior answer that ‘the English just went around’.

Meanwhile, the teacher begins to handle the course text.

Replacing the existing text on the overhead projector with a map in the course text (see Figures 2.1-2.2), at line 7 the teacher invites the students to ‘notice’ something in this object (Kääntä, 2014; Schegloff, 2007). While she is presenting a question about the spread of the British Empire (lines 9-11), she places her pencil horizontally on top of the map, bringing it in from the ‘North’ and resting it roughly where the Canada-USA border lies. This movement is choreographed with her slowly and emphatically produced talk, coming to stop during line 11. As in the prior extract, no response appears forthcoming during the silence at line 12, which the teacher takes as a signal for the need of further assistance. She specifically instructs where to ‘look’ for significance, indicating that the pencil is now part of the semiotic object that the map represents, a landmark that can be used to providing locational instruction (‘North of this pencil’). For the students, this now becomes a task of ‘looking’ and ‘seeing’ (line 15).

The teacher is already beginning to provide the answer by herself (line 17) as a student, Paavali, bids for a turn and, once having been nominated to respond, provides an answer over lines 18-20. Paavali first proposes a single geographical place, ‘Nunavut’, which is the northernmost of Canada’s territories. The answer is quite remarkable in that this information is extra-curricular (at least not dealt with during this course); yet, as a region of Canada, it does not fit with the terms of the question that ‘exclude’ Canada. This problem becomes visible during the 0.5 second

silence following the answer, during which the teacher does not take a turn. Instead, Paavali takes a lack of teacher uptake as a sign that his answer is incorrect or otherwise incomplete and corrects it by providing a broader area, the ‘northern parts’ (line 20). The new answer is curiously ambiguous as far as whether it refers to area in Canada or in the world.

The teacher immediately responds to line 20 with a token of agreement and continues by providing a reason why the English did not go to ‘northern parts’ of the world, areas of the map which she delineates with her pencil. Over lines 21-24 she constructs a humorous account for reasons guiding the directions of imperial expansion, namely that the English went where it is ‘nice and warm’ (see also Tainio & Laine, 2015, pp. 73-76, for how teachers can respond to student mistakes in humorous mode). Again, an important part of this claim is the pointing action that indicates to her students an area stretching roughly from Florida to nearly the southern tip of the American continent. These pointing actions – as well as the earlier resting of the pencil on top of the map – contribute towards making students notice a previously hidden rationalisation for the imperial expansion. As such, the teacher thus both describes an ideology, in the form of a way of thinking about and seeing the world, and attributes it to a nation in the past, ‘the English’. Importantly, here this work takes place through modifications of the semiotic structure in the material object in focus allow new things to be ‘looked’ at and ‘seen’ in it (lines 13, 15).

4.3 Pushing for the deconstruction of past ideologies in a history text

The previous extracts have illustrated how orienting and pointing to a classroom object can be used to foreground the multilingual nature of the classroom environment (extract 1) and how a modification of an object can provide a way to engage with worldviews in past times (extract 2).

Recognising different perspectives and using them to explain historical actions and events is an important part of history as a school subject, which previous pedagogical literature has addressed under the notion of historical empathy (e.g. Barton & Levstik, 2004, Endacott, 2010; Harris & Foreman-Peck, 2004). Barton and Levstik (2004, chapters 11-12) argue that historical empathy has both a cognitive and an affective dimension in that it not only includes the recognition of different perspectives but also feelings of care towards past individuals and events. The final extract shows how addressing such perspectives and feelings can be the interactional and instructional project when working with history texts. In the extract, a student, Mauri, is reporting his answer to a question that the teacher has previously assigned to him individually, along with a text that deals with the British attitudes towards the Empire and imperialism during its heyday. The question, which Mauri first reads aloud (lines 1-2) as he begins his answer, asks why these attitudes were mixed. In formulating the answer, Mauri reads aloud a lengthy paragraph in the assigned text (line 13, Appendix 2), which mentions the notion of the ‘White Man’s Burden’, originally coined by Rudyard Kipling. In the ensuing interaction, the teacher treats such a read-aloud response as insufficient and asks Mauri to explain the matter in his ‘own words’ as opposed to merely reproducing the text.

Extract 3. White man’s burden.

01 MAU uh why were the British (.) attitudes (.)
 02 towards the Empire mixed (0.6)
 03 well u:hm (0.7) there were many people under the (.)
 04 British rule an- (0.7) not all the: (.) acts of the (.)
 05 government we:re (.) to please them
 06 (0.5)
 07 TEA °mmh°
 08 (0.4)
 09 MAU err (.) and (0.3) also- (1.0) well some people, (1.2)
 10 well they just didn’t like the acts of the government.
 11 (0.4)
 12 TEA mmh.
 13 MAU ((READS ALOUD COURSE TEXT PASSAGE FOR 50 SECS, SEE APPENDIX 2))
 14 TEA °mmh°
 15 .hh hey now (.) put it (0.3) w- more simply

16 what on ↑earth did Kipling- (.) >Rudyard Kipling< it was the one
17 .hh he: >was an< Englishman living in (.) India
18 and one of th- the world's famous (.) author.
19 .hh ↑what does he mean when he wrote about
20 the <white man's burden.>
21 >can you< (0.3) can you put it in your own words (.) Mauri
22 did you get it this [(-)
23 MAU [erm
24 it like means that the white man should have (.) err (0.6)
25 err like err civilised all the (0.7) err (0.4) uncivilised
26 (.) or <foreigner> (0.4) people
27 TEA ↑yeah (.) ex↑actly
28 .hhh and (by) going to Africa or India
29 you have to bring the civili<sation>
30 which of course was the European one.
31 (0.4) .hh err and err (0.3) this:: err (.) err (.)
32 white man's ↑burden it's err-
33 and ↑many English felt that it's (shamefully)
34 that (went-) there- of course people didn't err
35 (0.4) err (0.6) (well-) the ones who >especially< lived abroad
36 (1.4) must have thought that hey this is not quite right
37 that we go e- elsewhere.
38 (1.2)
39 bu:t Rudyard Kip↑ling's (.) this (0.7)
40 po'em was (0.6) quoted quite a >lot and< uh (0.5)
41 err it's err (0.8) when you think of-
42 in England there has been (in) even- even my husband's childhood
43 they ce- celebrated Empire day
44 (0.6)
45 a::nd uh (0.9) when was it (0.4) April (.) (in) May (.)
46 >must have been< .hh yeah (.) so: it's uh:: err
47 it was the ↑atti↓tude (.) of the English (0.8) c:ivilising
48 (1.0) and being the (.) sort of err (0.5) °err° (.)
49 father figures to the whole (.) world

Mauri's answer at lines 3-5 does not respond to the question insofar as it provides no reason for the mixed attitudes apart from suggesting that some people were not 'pleased' with the government. Interestingly, such an answer does not engage with the moral aspects of imperialism but rather treats the mixed attitudes as a more bureaucratic phenomenon, some citizens' dislike of government 'acts' as opposed to a moral dilemma related to ruling other nations. The teacher's response at line 7 is minimal and includes no traces of a (positive) assessment of the Mauri's answer, which prompts him to continue answering over lines 9-10. This increment largely reiterates what he has just said, adding no substantial content to the answer. As even this does not receive a more enthusiastic teacher uptake (line 12), Mauri adds yet another increment

to his answer by reading aloud the paragraph of text which the question has targeted (shown in Appendix 2).

Once his read-aloud comes to completion, the teacher begins to instruct Mauri and the class in text interpretation, in what the text really ‘means’. She asks Mauri to simplify his answer (line 15) and, providing more contextual information about the author Rudyard Kipling (lines 16-18), topicalises the ‘White Man’s Burden’, which Mauri has just mentioned in reading aloud the text. Mauri is invited to make sense of the text and to put it in his ‘own words’ as to what the burden refers to. His response (lines 24-26) quite neatly not only constructs a meaning for it, an ideology that the white man ‘should have’ to civilise those who were ‘uncivilised’. It also invokes a category of people, ‘foreigners’, that could be equated with the ‘uncivilised’ according to the viewpoint of the ‘civilised’.

The teacher’s enthusiastic uptake at line 27 conveys that Mauri has succeeded in the task of historical empathy by recognising the ideology behind the White Man’s Burden. She continues by further explicating what counted as civilisation (‘the European one’) within imperialist thinking (lines 28-30) before she returns to the theme of mixed attitudes. Over lines 33-37, the teacher portrays the imperial expansion as a deeply moral matter by constructing an affective connection with the people of that time. She describes the bringing of civilisation as something that ‘many’ contemporary Englishmen ‘felt’ and ‘must have thought’ was ‘shameful’ or ‘not quite right’. These kinds of reported thoughts and feelings are attributed to a sub-section of the population, those who ‘lived abroad’. The teacher then contrasts such an unease with imperialism with the prevailing attitude of the English. For this, she uses what can be termed as

experience talk (Kääntä & Lehtinen, 2016), that is, she tells a personal story about how the Empire day was celebrated even relatively recently, up to the childhood of her (English) husband (lines 42-46). Notice that the preface to this short story ('when you think of') already projects that it will be followed by something that makes the story noteworthy and meaningful in light of the turn up to that point. Here the delivery of such further elaboration of the story's significance is signalled by the word 'so' (line 46), directly after which the teacher provides a summarising statement of the attitude behind the White Man's Burden, an ideology of which the Empire day celebration is an apt demonstration.

To sum up, extract 3 exhibits one way in which ideology, as the attitudes of a nation and its people towards other nations can be a part of classroom history texts and the target of instruction. As opposed to orienting the students' attention to the visible semiotic structures in the environment (extracts 1, 2), here the teacher's focus is on fostering students' critical literacy when dealing with the attitudes and ways of thinking of people in the past. She displays a clear orientation to pushing the answering student to go beyond the reiteration of the learning text and the reproduction of its ideology, something that she pursues by inviting him to say what the text means in his 'own words'. A key part of her instructional work involves forging a connection between the cognitive and affective domain of historical empathy (see Endacott, 2010) by not only teaching what the White Man's Burden means in some matter of fact sense but also addressing the diversity of contemporary emotions towards it. That and the telling of a personal story pave way to engaging with and deconstructing the ideology reported by the learning text in and through interaction (see also Laihonon & Tódor, 2015, for how materials often transmit uncritical views of history and culture).

5. DISCUSSION

This paper has investigated the schoolscape of a CLIL classroom in interactional sequences in which participants orient to their material environment in different ways. It has demonstrated the occasioned nature of the environment and (learning) materials, showing how attention to different kinds of texts, images and semiotic structures in the classroom can serve instructional purposes. In so doing, the study has contributed to the inquiry on the relationship between the environment, its affordances and social action (see e.g. Gibson, 1979; van Lier, 2004). The study can also help to understand the practical work of instruction (see also Lindwall, Lymer, & Greiffenhagen, 2015) in new ways by showing some ways in which teachers' practices for navigating the classroom environment by skilfully orienting to it, handling its objects as well as moving in the classroom are part of their professional competences.

The empirical analysis of this exploratory study has attempted to describe some ways in which a key component of the schoolscape, ideology, in different interpretations of the term, could be analysable as an *emic* interactional phenomenon, something that participants treat as the business-at-hand in their routine classroom work. More specifically, the analysis has shown how attention to objects and movement within the classroom can serve the enactment of a multilingual pedagogy that treats all available languages as resources (extract 1). It has also demonstrated how history teaching can quite routinely target ideologies of the past times as common sense attitudes that texts and other semiotic structures convey. Making such presumptions and ways of thinking visible, for example, by modifying a semiotic object (extract 2) as well as by treating the reproduction of a text as insufficient for the activity-at-hand (extract

3), can be seen as the teacher's work towards ensuring students engage critically with the ideologies that are manifested in their learning materials. While such a diversity in the investigated ideological work can be seen as a limitation of this study, its justification is the study's exploratory focus on identifying potential ways in which a CA approach could address the 'constitution, reproduction and transformation' of ideologies (Brown, 2012, p. 282), the key question in the emerging schoolscape literature.

The introduction to this article pointed out the necessity to investigate who in the classroom does the work of reproduction and transformation of ideology. In this regard, it is noteworthy that in all analysed extracts, it is very much the teacher who draws on the classroom environment so that students are led to discover its relevancies. For example, in extracts 1 and 2 the teacher's orientation to the environment follows a student's silence after a question, which suggests that her orientation to the environment works to promote the progression of the activity and address a problem in the provision of an answer. These observations raise a more general question about whether access to the environment as a situated resource for action may be asymmetrically distributed in the classroom and as such construct asymmetrical power relations.¹ Such access may also be configured by classroom activity types: in activities organised around Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequences – of which all analysed extracts are examples – it is the teacher's local role to initiate sequences of action. A division of labour such as this may account for who orients to the material environment and for what purposes. On the other hand, other kinds of activities can provide for more (and different kind of) student engagement with the environment. A case in point is students' task work involving various texts, which can routinely

¹ I wish to thank Kara Brown for drawing my attention to this.

work as a local resource for conducting interaction (see e.g. Jakonen, 2015). Besides the nature of task activities, it may also be that in a setting such as CLIL where students face the task of dealing with not only new content but also the foreign language, there may be a heightened need for concrete support provided by the teacher in the form of orientation to available materials.

A key aim of this study has been to answer Brown's (2012) call for research on spoken aspects of schoolscapes by investigating them from a broadly speaking multimodal CA perspective. Adopting an interactional perspective can, first of all, help researchers see *how* and *when* the environment and the ideologies therein become a concern to the participants. Moreover, a multimodal research orientation can point to how such negotiation is not only a matter of talk but is also constructed through ways of handling and orienting to classroom texts and other kinds of material artefacts. Thirdly, a close analysis of instances where participants orient to (language) ideologies at the very least demonstrates that the notion of ideology and the mechanisms through which it operates within the schoolscape are complex issues. This study has shown that in bilingual educational contexts such as CLIL, the notion of 'ideology' is not only reserved for normalised attitudes and ways of thinking about languages, their speakers and the relationship between these two, but it can also intersect with subject pedagogies. A subject such as history routinely addresses 'ideology' but perhaps as a phenomenon of different order from the relationship between languages as well as their presence within a material space (see also Laihonon & Tódor, 2015). Instead, 'ideology' in the domain of history teaching represents a phenomenon that students can be instructed to detect in texts and documents by relating to the perspective of people in the past times. All in all, investigating ideology in actual instances of classroom interaction can assist in seeing its constitution, reproduction and transformation,

processes that are usually investigated through the production, circulation and interpretation of texts, as social actions in the classroom, a verb instead of a noun.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the two anonymous reviewers as well as Kara Brown, Petteri Laihonen and Tamás Péter Szabó for their insightful and constructive comments on previous versions of this article. Any remaining errors, omissions and shortcomings are, of course, my own. I would also like to acknowledge the support of the Finnish Cultural Foundation, which funded this research through a postdoctoral grant.

APPENDIX 1. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS.

The multimodal transcription follows the system developed by Lorenza Mondada (2014a), available at:

https://franz.unibas.ch/fileadmin/franz/user_upload/redaktion/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf

- . .
- * * two identical symbols (one symbol per participant) delimit descriptions of embodied actions, being synchronized with talk
- *---> embodied action continues across subsequent lines
- >* shows the end of the embodied action
- >> action begins before the excerpt's beginning
- >> action continues after the excerpt's end
- tea identifies the participant doing the embodied action when (s)he is not the speaker
- teaW describes walking
- teaH describes hand movement
- fig displays the moment at which a screenshot has been taken
- # indicates the timing of the screen shot within talk

APPENDIX 2. LINE 13 IN EXTRACT 3 (MAURI'S READ-ALOUD).

13 MAU err (0.9) British attitudes (0.5) towards the Empire (.) were mixed (0.9) Empire meant trade and profit but the other side of the coin was the conviction that British had a d- duty to bring British ideas of democracy and law (0.7) to primitive people. (1.1) Kipling described this (.) in the- it as the white man's burden (0.7) (- the) err hhh (0.5) Joseph (0.4) Chamberlain (.) eighteen thirty-six (0.5) to: nineteen fourteen (0.5) colonial secretary- secretary from eighteen ninety-five (0.5) to nineteen oh three. (0.6) wanted to expand the Empire (.) for the benefit of all (0.9) we are land owners of (.) a great estate (0.3)

it is the duty of the landow- (.) landlord to develop (0.3)
his estate (1.6) the enthusiasm (0.4) (--)
both the Empire and civilization had a brutal and ugly side (0.5)
as numerous wars of imperial expansion °demonstrated° (1.3)

REFERENCES

- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Billig, M. (1999). Whose Terms? Whose Ordinarity? Rhetoric and Ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 543–558.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010004005>
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2013). Multilingual label quests: A practice for the “asymmetrical” multilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(2), 142–164.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2012.12.006>
- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187–206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, K. D. (2012). The Linguistic Landscape of Educational Spaces: Language Revitalization and Schools in Southeastern Estonia. In D. Gorter, H. F. Marten, & L. van Mensel (Eds.), *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp. 281–298). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coyle, D. (2008). CLIL—A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In N. van Deusen-Scholl & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2nd edition, volume 4: *Second and foreign language education* (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 97–111). Berlin: Springer.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Deppermann, A. (2013). Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.11.014>
- Endacott, J. L. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 38(1), 6–47.
- Evnitskaya, N. (2012). *Talking science in a second language: The interactional co-construction of dialogic explanations in the CLIL science classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
- Ford, C. E. (1999). Collaborative construction of task activity: coordinating multiple resources in a high school physics lab. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(4), 369–408.
http://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973rls3204_3
- Fukuda, C. (2015). Identities and linguistic varieties in Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 24(1), 35–62.
- Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation Analysis. *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 262–284.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757000.ch10>
- Gibson, J. (1979). *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1992). Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 77–99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greiffenhagen, C. (2014). The materiality of mathematics: Presenting mathematics at the

- blackboard. *British Journal of Sociology*, 65(3), 502-528.
- Guerrettaz, A. M., & Johnston, B. (2013). Materials in the classroom ecology. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 779–796. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12027.x>
- Hanauer, D. (2009). Science and the linguistic landscape: a genre analysis of representational wall space in a microbiology laboratory. In E. Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: expanding the scenery* (pp. 287–301). New York: Routledge.
- Harris, R., & Foreman-Peck, L. (2004). ‘Stepping into other people's shoes’: teaching and assessing empathy in the Secondary History Curriculum. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 1-14.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2002). *Conversation analysis: principles, practices and applications* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jakonen, T. (2015). Handling knowledge: Using classroom materials to construct and interpret information requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 89, 100–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.10.001>
- Jakonen, T. (2016a). Managing multiple normativities in classroom interaction: student responses to teacher reproaches for inappropriate language choice in a bilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 33, 14–27.
- Jakonen, T. (2016b). The integration of content and language in students’ task answer production in the bilingual classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (advance access). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1267694>.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Kitzinger, C. (2005). "Speaking as a Heterosexual": (How) Does Sexuality Matter for Talk-in-Interaction? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(3), 221-265.
- Koole, T., & Elbers, E. (2014). Responsiveness in teacher explanations: A conversation analytical perspective on scaffolding. *Linguistics and Education*, 26, 57–69. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.02.001>
- Kunitz, S. (2015). Scriptlines as emergent artifacts in collaborative group planning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 135–149. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.10.012>
- Kupetz, M. (2011). Multimodal resources in students’ explanations in CLIL interaction. *Novitas ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(1), 121–142.
- Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: students’ epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 86–105. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.010>
- Kääntä, L., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2013). Manual Guiding in Peer Group Interaction: A Resource for Organizing a Practical Classroom Task. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(4), 322–343. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2013.839094>
- Kääntä, L., & Lehtinen, E. (2016). Patterns of experience talk and argumentation in digital peer learning discussions. *Language@Internet*, 13, article 2. (urn:nbn:de:0009-7-44078)
- Laihonen, P. (2008). Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(5), 668–693. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00387.x>
- Laihonen, P., & Tódor, E.-M. (2015). The changing schoolscape in a Szekler village in Romania: signs of diversity in rehungarization. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and*

- Bilingualism*, (August 2015), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051943>
- Lindwall, O., & Ekström, A. (2012). Instruction-in-Interaction: The Teaching and Learning of a Manual Skill. *Human Studies*, 35(1), 27–49. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-012-9213-5>
- Lindwall, O., Lymer, G., & Greiffenhagen, C. (2015). The Sequential Analysis of Instruction. Llinares, A., & Morton, T. (2010). Historical explanations as situated practice in content and language integrated learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(1), 46–65. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19463011003750681>
- Majlesi, A. R. (2014). Finger dialogue: the embodied accomplishment of learnables in instructing grammar on a worksheet. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 64, 35–51. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.01.003>
- Markee, N. (2015). Where Does Research on Classroom Discourse and Interaction Go From Here? In *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* (pp. 507–526). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118531242.ch30>
- Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2013). Doing Planning and Task Performance in Second Language Acquisition: An Ethnomethodological Respecification. *Language Learning*, 63(4), 629–664. <http://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12019>
- Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA Studies of Classroom Interaction. In *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* (pp. 425–439). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118531242.ch25>
- Maynard, D. W. (2012). Everyone and No One to Turn to: Intellectual Roots and Contexts for Conversation Analysis. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 9–31). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch2>
- Mchoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7(2), 183–213. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005522>
- Merke, S. (2016). Establishing the explainable in Finnish-as-a-foreign-language classroom interaction: Student-initiated explanation sequences. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.03.002>
- Mondada, L. (2014a). *Conventions for multimodal transcription*. Basel: Romanisches Seminar der Universität.
- Mondada, L. (2014b). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 137–156. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.04.004>
- Mortensen, K., & Hazel, S. (2011). Initiating round robins in the L2 classroom - preliminary observations. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 5(1), 55–70.
- Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T., & Rauniomaa, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Interacting with Objects: Language, materiality, and social activity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <http://doi.org/10.1075/z.186>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. (1997). Whose Text? Whose Context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165–187. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002002>
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An introduction*.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2005). Introduction: multimodal interaction. *Semiotica*, 2005(156), 1–20. <http://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2005.2005.156.1>
- Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (2011). Embodied interaction in the material world: an

- introduction. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World* (pp. 1–26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szabó, T. P. (2015). The management of diversity in schoolscapes: an analysis of Hungarian practices. *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(1), 23–51.
- Szymanski, M. H. (2003). Producing text through talk: Question-answering activity in classroom peer groups. *Linguistics and Education*, 13(4), 533–563. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(03\)00003-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(03)00003-2)
- Tainio, L. (2012). The role of textbooks in Finnish mother tongue and literature classrooms. In H. Lehti-Eklund, A. Slotte-Lüttge, B. Silén, & R. Heilä-Ylikallio (Eds.), *Skriptpraktiker hos barn och unga* (pp. 11–33). Vasa: Åbo Akademi.
- Tainio, L., & Laine, A. (2015). Emotion work and affective stance in the mathematics classroom: the case of IRE sequences in Finnish classroom interaction. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 89(1), 67–87.
- van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: a sociocultural perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2003). Constructing identities: A feminist conversation analytic approach to positioning in action. In R. Harré, & F. M. Moghaddam (Eds.), *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political, and cultural contexts* (pp. 157–180). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387–412. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005>
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1994), 55–82. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415>