

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Duran, Derya; Kurhila, Salla; Sert, Olcay

**Title:** Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in an English as medium of instruction context

**Year:** 2022

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2019 Taylor & Francis

**Rights:** In Copyright

**Rights url:** <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

**Please cite the original version:**

Duran, D., Kurhila, S., & Sert, O. (2022). Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in an English as medium of instruction context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 502-521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1703896>

## Word search sequences in teacher-student interaction in an English as medium of instruction context

### Abstract

This study explores the ways students in a higher education setting engage in word searches. The investigation draws on 30-hour video recordings of content classes in an English as a medium of instruction university in Turkey. Using conversation analysis, the study focuses on the interactionally accomplished functions of vocal and visual practices deployed by the students in the course of a word search. The study revealed that word searches are constructed through publicly visible resources (i.e., gaze, body orientation, gestures) and explicit formulaic expressions (i.e., how can I say it?), and accomplished via bilingual resources. It was also observed that the teacher does not orient to word searches when there is a need to interactionally monitor and manage the repairable content (i.e., pedagogical content, subject-specific word), thus prioritizing content over second language (i.e., English) use in the current content-oriented setting. The study contributes to our understanding of how the participants' situated roles as a student and teacher are contingently negotiated in the ongoing word search in bilingual classroom contexts.

**Keywords:** Classroom interaction, code-switching, conversation analysis, English as a medium of instruction, word searches

### 1. Introduction

English as a medium of instruction (EMI), in higher education, is “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Macaro, Curle, Pun, An and Dearden 2018, p. 37). EMI is not just a linguistic and educational reality, but also a political one. Top-down *policies*, which are not always informed by research have shaped the growth of EMI and have brought in questions with regards to the attainment of disciplinary goals. Policies have recently been questioned around the world: for instance, while Airey et al. (2017) critically investigated the expansion of EMI in the Nordic countries (i.e., Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden), Belhiah and Elhami (2015) surveyed the Gulf region and criticized existing language education policies. It is obvious, then, that we need bottom-up research that reveals the pedagogical practices in EMI as they unfold in actual classrooms, before any top-down policy is employed. Such bottom-up research, while helping us understand the pedagogical practices in higher education classrooms, can reveal the interactional dynamics of language policies as they are co-constructed in ongoing interactions between students and teachers.

Bottom-up, micro-analytic, classroom-based interactional research has started to reveal how language choice and micro-level language policies are enacted in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms (e.g., Amir and Musk 2013; Author; Gynne 2019; Malabarba

2019) as well as in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms (e.g., Jakonen 2016). A close description of interactional patterns and language choice is also required for EMI classrooms in higher education, as such research would help us understand whether and how policies are translated into situated teaching and learning activities. In a very recent systematic review of EMI in higher education, it has been put forward that the likelihood of the content to be misunderstood and poorly internalized in EMI classrooms is “simply greater when it is being learnt through a less proficient second language (L2)” (Macaro et al. *ibid.*, p. 66). Yet, conversation analytic research into classrooms (e.g., Author) have revealed that understanding the interplay between multiple languages in L2 classrooms and emerging pedagogical affordances requires a multimodal and micro-analytic investigation that showcases where institutional fingerprints of interaction and enacted language policies intersect. Furthermore, following Macaro, Tian and Chu (2018), the role of language choice in learning content and language needs to be explicated to inform future teacher education policies.

Against this background, our paper focuses on a phenomenon that is at the intersection of classroom language policy and micro-analysis of EMI classroom interaction: word searches. A word search can be initiated by an interactant, in this case by a student, through a demonstrable search for a concept, which is then subsequently followed by an orientation (or lack of it) by the co-participant. As our review in the next section will show, word searches have been subject to investigation both in first language (L1) settings and in L2 classrooms, however, to our knowledge, no research focused on word search sequences in EMI classrooms in higher education. Our corpus consists of 30 hours of interaction from two content classrooms in an EMI university in Turkey. Using multimodal conversation analysis (CA), we analyzed all instances of word searches in teacher-student interaction and revealed how they are enacted through the use of L1 resources. We also documented the cases in which word search activities are not resolved by the participants, all in all explicating four sub-categories in the collection. Our findings provide insights into the institutional interactional features of EMI classrooms and help us better understand how language choice functions at language and content level in bilingual classroom interaction.

## **2. Review of literature**

In what follows, we begin by briefly reviewing the CA literature on word search sequences, and introduce a discussion of embodied practices in word searches. We then present previous research on word searches in second language interaction. Finally, we briefly examine the existing literature on the use of L1 resources in bilingual educational contexts.

### **Word searches in CA tradition**

In CA terminology, a word search refers to a specific kind of ‘repair’, where a speaker displays difficulty in producing an appropriate linguistic item (Siegel 2016). In this sense, it is a forward-oriented repair (Schegloff 1979) as it targets an upcoming problem to restore mutual understanding among the interlocutors in interaction. A fair amount of research has studied word searches from a CA perspective in different settings (Author; Chiarenza 2010; Helasvuo 2004; Lin 2014; Park 2007; Radford 2009; Siegel 2016; Svennevig 2018) and some of these studies have investigated verbal resources employed during word search activities (Author; Brouwer 2003; Hayashi 2003; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). The initiation of a word search may be accompanied through the use of hedges like ‘I am not sure’ (Author) or explicit search markers (e.g., what is it?; how do you say that?) (Brouwer 2003; Park 2007), which are self-directed or other-directed questions depending on a speaker’s gaze orientation. The evidence for word search trouble is also displayed through speech perturbations (Schegloff et al. 1977) such as sound stretches, turn holding tokens (e.g., um, uh, ehm etc.), cut offs, and pauses, which demonstrate that the speaker is engaged in a word search activity. These verbal devices break up the syntax of the talk and initiate a trouble source turn.

Try-marking, displayed through a rise in intonation for a candidate understanding (Sacks and Schegloff 1979), is also used as a resource in word searching. However, Koshik and Seo (2012) propose that try-marking might perform different actions in the context of a word search: it could (1) bid a candidate solution for confirmation, or (2) receive a specific term by offering a more general term when used at the end of the word search, and it could (3) obtain confirmation of the content of the talk, or (4) elicit confirmation of understanding when used at the end of a possible candidate solution. In this regard, the sequential position of the try-marker determines the interactional services it meets. Grammatical designs are also deployed during word searches. For instance, in collaborative searches, the speaker engaged in word searching forms the turn grammatically so that the recipients take part in the search and complete it collaboratively (Lerner 1996). Lerner (1996) maintains that the word search generally occurs near the end of the unit, and thus provides a conditional entry for the recipients. As a bilingual resource in the resolution of word finding difficulties, code-switching is also observed in speakers’ searches to indicate changes in their orientation toward the interaction (Greer 2008; Mori and Hasegawa 2009). More clearly, it allows a shared understanding among the interlocutors. It might be used as a tool for self-repair in which word searchers indicate that they are searching for a word but they cannot produce it in the other speaker’s language in cross-cultural conversation (Funayama 2002).

### **Word searches and embodied practices**

The importance of the use of nonverbal resources in word searches is also well-documented in the literature (Chiarenza 2010; Greer 2013; Olsher 2004). The seminal paper by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) describes how gestures, including gaze shifts and a thinking face come into play at particular points in interaction. These nonverbal practices employed by both speakers and recipients have been consequential in ongoing word search activities. For instance, when speakers shift their gaze from the recipients during the initiation of word searching and also show a characteristic facial expression of a ‘thinking face’, recipients consider the withdrawal of the gaze as a sign of solitary word search in which the speaker is engaged in the searching for a word. On the other hand, gazing towards the recipients during a word search is often considered as a need for the recipients’ involvement in the activity. Gaze shifts are therefore a systematic component of word searches in co-participation framework. Apart from gaze behaviors, nonverbal resources such as hand gestures are also used in the interactional service for word search sequences. In the course of word searching, speakers may raise their palms or fingers as a turn holding device (Ekman 1999), scratch their heads (Ahlsén 1985), and use pointing and iconic gestures to mark their search (Hadar 1991; McNeill 1992). For instance, novice L2 speakers project the trajectory of turns-in-progress, cease to talk and complete the action through embodied conduct in order to establish intersubjectivity and this practice has been coined as ‘embodied completion’ (Mori and Hayashi 2006; Olsher 2004), which is not peculiar to second language learners and is not a result of low competence. In this sense, gestures, especially iconic ones are of particular importance as they help interactants draw on semantic information in the resolution of the searched-for word (Hadar and Butterworth 1997). Furthermore, speakers engaged in word searching focus their gaze on their gestures when attempting to produce the missing linguistic item (Chiarenza 2010). In this respect, gestures demonstrate how the present movement is critical for the intersubjectivity in the emerging interaction.

### **Word searches in L2 speaker talk**

A large strand of research has focused on the co-construction of word search activities in native/non-native speaker and L2 speakers’ interaction (Author; Koshik and Seo 2012; Svennevig 2018). As the searched-for item is generally a content word in these interactions, an unsuccessful word search activity might have adverse consequences such as communication breakdowns (Author). Drawing on her L1-L2 Finnish interactions data, Author describes how non-native speakers search for either a lexical item or a grammatical one, while native speakers are generally engaged in searching for a lexical item. She also observes that during word

searching, while L1 speakers appeal immediately for help, the non-native speakers typically try to solve the search by themselves, and therefore act as more responsible interactants.

Focusing on L1 and L2 Japanese interactions, Hosoda (2006) finds that L2 speakers generally stop the turn constructional unit to ask for confirmation from the L1 speaker for the accuracy of the lexical item produced, which functions as a vocabulary check practice. L2 speakers make use of a variety of resources (e.g., cut-offs, sound stretches) to mark the initiation of the word search. Hosoda (ibid.) maintains that two different categories, namely 'novice' and 'expert' positions, are developed as by receiving confirmation of the native speakers, L2 speakers portray themselves as 'novices' of languages while L1 speakers are positioned as language 'experts' considering the language support they provide for the non-native speakers. In the same line, drawing on English as a second language tutoring sessions, Seo (2008) focuses on student-initiated repair, with a particular interest in the instances where students ask for confirmation of the candidate solution in lexical items. These instances are quite similar to what Hosoda (2006) has labelled as 'vocabulary check'. However, Seo's study also demonstrates that rather than providing the appropriate lexical item, tutors attempt to elicit the completion from the student and these sequences are generally turned into mini-teaching sessions. Considering the pedagogical merit of word search activities in non-pedagogical settings, Brouwer (2003) analyzes the interaction between L1 and L2 speakers of Danish. She demonstrates that word searches may play an important role in language learning when "(a) the other participant is invited to participate in the search, and (b) the interactants demonstrate an orientation to language expertise, with one participant being a novice and the other being an expert" (p. 542).

Similarly, Siegel (2016), analyzing interactions between two L2 speakers of English longitudinally in an English as a lingua franca setting, finds that the speakers' identities as language experts or novices are quite recognizable in the management of linguistic knowledge, more specifically, in the self- and other-positioning in word search sequences. Lastly, Svennevig (2018) examines how L2 speakers learn new technical terms in the course of workplace encounters. He finds that by using embodied means to refer to the searched-for word and asking the L1 speaker what it is called in Norwegian, the L2 speaker repeats the word when provided and it is often done with emphatic prosody. This repeat is important in that it functions as a request for confirmation from the L1 speaker and L1 speakers provide additional models of pronunciation. Moreover, the word is turned into a learnable in the course of expanding the word search sequence. Therefore, teaching and learning technical words become a usual activity in the process of workplace interaction. All in all, the asymmetry of the interactants'

language competence may shape the repair practices in native and non-native talk, and thus unpacks the issue of identity and repertoires of the interlocutors. It might also bring about pedagogical outcomes such as vocabulary learning as described in previous work (Brouwer 2003; Hosoda 2006; Svennevig 2018) above. In what follows, we will briefly review the related literature on the use of L1 resources in bilingual educational settings.

### **Language alternation in bilingual educational contexts**

Code-switching has been shown to be an integral interactional practice in bilingual educational settings. The argument that the use of first and additional languages can be detrimental to language and content learning has been reconsidered under the lens of prior language alternation research (Lee and Macaro 2013; Morton 2015; Morton and Evnitskaya 2011; Macaro et al. 2018) and the belief that L1s should be employed in cases where it would facilitate learning has been strengthened in recent studies (Lin and Wu 2015; Macaro et al. 2018; Morton and Evnitskaya 2018), thus revealing the importance of embracing students' linguistic repertoires as an asset in the learning processes (Wei and Lin 2019). Lin (2005) describes student and teacher code-switching practices as "local, pragmatic, coping tactics and responses to the socioeconomic dominance of English in Hong Kong, where many students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds with limited access to English resources struggled to acquire an English-medium education for its socioeconomic value" (p. 46; see also Lin 1996). A general finding related to students' use of L1 resources when the teacher is not available is that the use of bilingual resources tends to occur in small groups (i.e., peer talk, group work) rather than in whole-class interaction (Copp Jinkerson 2011; Dalton-Puffer 2007; Jakonen 2016; Jakonen, Szabó and Laihonen 2018, and see Nikula 2007 for functions of L1 use in CLIL contexts). Jakonen (2016) found that CLIL students "displayed normative orientation to using L1 in front of peers" (p. 25) for the purposes of task management and socializing, regardless of the teacher's constant explicit language policing in group work, which partly explains the observation that those students tend to prefer to use their first language over the institutionally-assigned target language in peer interaction (i.e., see also Dalton-Puffer 2007).

In research literature focusing on EMI contexts, few studies to date have addressed conversational activities such as language alternation and word searches from a conversation analytic perspective (Author, see Malmstrom, Mezek, Pecorari, Shaw and Irvine 2017 for a non-CA study), which clearly indicates the novelty of the current study for EMI research. Although previous research into word searches has contributed extensively to our understanding of its interactional mechanism in naturally occurring L2 interaction across

different settings and languages, to the best of our knowledge, no CA studies on the current phenomenon have been carried out within full EMI settings. Furthermore, none of them have studied the instances of word finding problems which fail to result in a joint activity through their recipients' co-participation, in our cases the teacher, as the co-participant. As intended outcomes are content-oriented in EMI classrooms, that is, language teaching is not overtly targeted, we argue that investigating word searching, an explicit linguistic issue, in content classrooms will expand our horizon on the dynamics of classroom pedagogical foci in EMI contexts. More specifically, we propose that enactment and treatment of the word searches will be different in an EMI setting which has its own unique institutional features (also see Authors). Drawing on empirical research on students' situated practices (i.e., word search activity) and using CA, the current study presents an analysis of student word search activities in an EMI context. Specifically, we aim to investigate how students use various resources for the resolution of word searches in the praxis of bilingual classrooms, and thereby we also provide some implications for language pedagogy in EMI.

### **3. Methods**

#### ***3.1. The data***

The data come from video-recordings of 30 hours of interaction from two content classrooms in an EMI university in Turkey. The classes were observed over two months during the spring 2015. An important feature of the current research setting is that all 'official' teaching is expected to be normatively performed using English. That is, participants were supposed to interact in English as it is the 'institutionally assigned medium of instruction.' However, in addition to English, students spoke Turkish, the shared language for all the participants in the classroom, especially in peer groups or in one-to-one encounters with the teacher. The course, 'Guidance' is a compulsory module, offered to senior (4<sup>th</sup> year) undergraduate students in the Faculty of Education. Participants (n=78) were studying different departmental subjects (i.e., Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Elementary and Early Childhood Education, Foreign Language Education, and Mathematics and Science Education). In the first class, there were 37 female and 2 male students, aged between 21 and 25 years old. In the second class, there were 30 females and 9 males, and their age varied from 22 to 26. Both classes were instructed by the same lecturer. The lecturer was an experienced associate professor of Psychological Counselling in the Department of Educational Sciences. Before the collection of the data, consent forms from the participants and ethical approval from the University Institutional Review Board were received. In order to secure the anonymity of the participants, pseudonyms and blurred images were used in the study.



### **3.2. Data analysis**

We adopted CA as the methodological framework for the present study. CA draws on naturally occurring data and analyses are illustrated through the transcriptions of visual recordings that capture as much detail as possible with regards to talk, bodily behaviors, and the material world. We used three cameras to record the lessons so that we could include both verbal and nonverbal features as well as prosodic information in transcriptions. We adopted Jefferson (2004) transcription conventions (see Appendix) with slight additions. Using CA, in recurrent review of the data, we identified ‘student word search activities’, generally characterized by (1) a student’s initiation of a word search, (2) the teacher’s or a peer’s (dis)orientation to the search, and (3) the termination or abandonment of the search. These word search episodes occurred in teacher-student interactions in the public sphere of the classroom (i.e., whole-class discussions, plenary talk). A collection of student word searches was formed and analyzed line-by-line.

From the whole dataset, ten cases emerged where students engaged in a word search activity. These interactions build the basis for the current study. Analysis closely focused on the sequential organization of these sequences, describing possible orientations to the search in interaction. Analysis also focused on detailing the verbal (i.e., self-addressed questions) and nonverbal (i.e., manual and facial gestures, gaze) features of each of the turns at talk in the sequence. The identified cases were compared to see the similarities in their contextual and functional characteristics. Four categories of student word search activities were detected: (1) word searches completed by students themselves through L1 resources, (2) word searches completed by peers, (3) word searches completed by the teacher, and (4) word searches unattended by the teacher. For the scope of the current study, we will closely focus on instances in which students provide a candidate solution to the search through L1 resources (Category 1) and cases in which word searches are not resolved by either party (i.e., student, teacher) (Category 4). These particular cases contribute to furthering our understanding of the institutional fingerprints of EMI academic settings. That is, use of bilingual resources and lack of orientation to linguistic problems in the current content-oriented context provide important insights into unpacking the institutional features of EMI settings. In the following section, we will analyze two extracts for each of these two categories.

### **4. Analysis and findings**

We first demonstrate how a word search activity is resolved through students’ code-switching practices (Extracts 1 and 2), and then provide examples on how a searched-for item is not oriented to by the teacher (Extracts 3 and 4). While the first two examples focus on a specific practice (i.e., presenting students’ own solution to a search through L1 resources in bilingual

settings), the last two examples illustrate the institutional goal (i.e., prioritizing content over language) in content-oriented classrooms.

#### ***4.1. Word searches completed through L1 resources***

Extract 1 is an example of how bilingual resources are being used in the resolution of a word search activity. Prior to this part of the interaction, students were sharing their experiences of effective time management in a whole-class discussion and the teacher directed a question to Tan on the possibilities of making any plans in a typical day in his life.

**Extract 1: Spontaneously, 12\_03\_15**

01 Tan: =no actually er: generally there are (.) some p↑lans (.)  
02 +T nods  
03 T: huh huh.  
+nods  
04 →Tan: but er: it's-  
05 (1.6) #1



Figure 1

06 → what can i ↑sa:y  
#2



Figure 2

07 (1.1) {(Gaze upwards)}  
08 T: so there are certain must do activities [that you can easily follow  
09 Tan: [huh yeah i am doing that and ↑then  
10 others er: it will  
11 (0.4) {(T opens her arms)}  
12 T: o:kay  
#3



Figure 3

13 →Tan: >doğaçlama<  
**spontaneous**  
14 T: okay spontaneously you will ha:ve a kind of ↑free ti:me..  
15 +Tan and ss laugh

Tan provides a contradictory response (i.e., shifting from a negative answer to a positive one) to T's inquiry on any potential plans in his daily life, which receives continuers (i.e., huh huh, nods) from T, displaying her understanding that the telling is not yet complete. Continuing his telling, Tan displays trouble producing the next item due in his ongoing turn at talk: he begins the turn with the contrastive conjunction 'but', followed by a couple of non-lexical

speech perturbations (i.e., hesitation marker ‘eɾ:’; cut-off ‘it’s-’) to project the possibility of repair-initiation (line 4). During the 1.6 second silence in which the word search is still in progress, Tan shifts his gaze from T and produces a characteristic “thinking face” (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986, p. 57). He snaps his fingers (see Fig. 1), displaying a search for a precise word and thus makes the word search activity more recognizable with the accompanied hand gesture. Following these embodied practices, Tan produces a formulaic expression (i.e., *what can i †sa:y*), an explicit self-directed word search marker (Author; Koshik and See 2012) to gain time for self-repair, or to appeal for help in production of the trouble word (Radford 2009). Moreover, delivered with a markedly rising intonation and elongation, ‘†sa:y’ in the syntactic question displays that a word search is in progress (Koshik and Seo 2012; Schegloff 1979). The self-addressed question and the following 1.1 second of silence are accompanied by the orientational shifts (Hayashi 2003). That is, Tan does not maintain mutual gaze with T (see Fig. 2), instead he looks up. The withdrawal of gaze from T starts when the search for the missing word begins. Such behavior has been found to be a critical element for recipients to offer a candidate solution or not (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986; Stivers and Rossano 2010).

In line 8, T attempts to close the word search repair sequence by providing her candidate reading of Tan’s previous talk instead of providing the missing word. Note that by demonstrating her candidate understanding of prior student turn, she engages in repairing the sequence (Author). After confirming T’s turn, he continues his turn with a prosodically salient (i.e., high pitch) follow-up (i.e., *and †then*), which projects a different telling from his previous utterance. It should be noted that this might be related to seeking a more precise word in this interactional practice. In line 10, he attempts to elaborate on his unplanned activities, but displays difficulty (i.e., hesitation, pause) with an upcoming lexical item for the second time. In the next turn, T opens her arms and following a brief silence, closes her arms accompanied with the acknowledgment marker ‘o†kaɣ’, which might act as a closure-implicative token along with the gesture (see Fig. 3). In line 13, Tan produces the prosodically-marked L1 equivalent of the searched-for word (>doğaçlama<, tr: ‘spontaneous’). With this student-initiated code-switching (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005), the student resorts to L1 for a lexical problem in a word search sequence. As is visible from the example, even if a candidate solution is provided by T (i.e., teacher’s candidate understanding in line 8), it is up to the student to accept the contribution or not, that is, it is the student (i.e., the original speaker) who knows exactly what he is searching for.

It is evident that even if Tan uses L1, he and the other students do not treat L1 as an equivalent linguistic choice. This is displayed by the fact that the students laugh after the code-switching turn, that is, laughter is used as means to frame ‘linguistically marked choices’ (Author). Claiming an understanding of the target word with the newsmarker ‘okay’, T provides the English equivalent (i.e., spontaneously) of the L1 word and closes the sequence. Confirming the candidate word by translating it into L2, T upholds the L2-only rule in the particular setting as well as serves as a ‘bilingual dictionary’ (Butzkamm 1998). Put it differently, as English is the ‘institutionally assigned target language’ in the current setting, the use of Turkish may be considered as a deviation from the norm, which indicates the commitment of the teacher to maintain the medium of instruction in L2.

Extract 1 has demonstrated how L1 is used as an interactional resource in the resolution of a word search and how it is immediately oriented to by the teacher in an EMI context. The word search activity, flagged with ‘extended’ self-repairs (Author) such as a hesitation marker (i.e., er:), cut-off (i.e., it’s-), explicit self-addressed search marker (i.e., what can i ↑sa:y), rising intonation and vowel elongations (i.e., ↑sa:y), embodied actions (i.e., snapping fingers and diverging gazes), which serve as transitional resources for the upcoming language alternation, has been successfully accomplished with the bilingual resources available to the participants. By switching from L2 (i.e., English) to L1 (i.e., Turkish) for the missing word following an extended stretch of self-repairs, the student produces the exact word he is searching for in the current forward-oriented repair sequence. In other words, he comes up with a candidate solution through L1, which is deployed much later in the search, which confirms the student’s commitment to the search in L2 mode. Note that instead of the student who accepts a candidate solution offered by the teacher, it is the teacher who confirms the candidate word provided by the student through translating the L1 word (i.e., doğaçlama) into L2 (i.e., spontaneously). What is of importance is that the word search completed with the help of L1 resources is treated to be in need of translation to the institutionally assigned language (i.e., English), and thus the teacher orients to the L1 and the L2 as distinct codes. Interestingly, the immediate L2 translation following the L1 word along with the students’ laughter indicates that both the teacher and the students are aware that L1 is not an ‘official language’ in the current bilingual classroom (Amir and Musk 2013).

Extract 2 also illustrates how a word search activity is resolved through code-switching. Different from the previous extract, this segment demonstrates how linguistic alignment is achieved by the student through changing her language code from Turkish to English as the

teacher remains in the L2 mode. Prior to this extract, students were discussing the different functions of counselling activities in a whole-class discussion.

**Extract 2: Discover their potentials, 26\_02\_15**

01 Sev: er: it can be help to functions the differentiating-  
 02 T: +walks towards Sev -->  
 03 Sev: differentiating function of the education because (0.5)  
 04 it is important to  
 05 (0.9) #4



Figure 4

06 er::  
 +closes her hands  
 07 (0.9)  
 08 → °açığa çıkarmak°  
**uncover**  
 #5



Figure 5

09 (0.7)  
 10 T: uh-huh  
 11 Sev: °it is important°  
 12 (0.7)  
 13 yani öğrencilerin şeylerini bilgi ve becerilerini yada neye  
**i mean they might be helpful in uncovering the students'**  
 14 şeye yatkın olduklarını açığa çıkarmada yardımcı olabilirler  
**knowledge and skills or what they are inclined to**  
 15 (0.3)  
 16 T: °o,kay° you may help the individuals to discover their  
 17 poten[tials]  
 18 Sev: [yeah °yes°  
 19 T: uh-huh o,kay  
 20 Sev: but er: our friend shared er: with her experience with...

In lines 1 through 4, Sev produces an answer on what counselling activities can offer in pedagogical settings. Following a 0.9 second silence, Sev shows her empty palms (see Fig. 4), which displays that something is missing, and it is followed by a hesitation marker (er:) during which she closes her hands. Silence (0.9 sec), embodied actions (i.e., opening and closing her hands) and hesitation marker (i.e., er:) all indicate that Sev has difficulty with accessing a

lexical item, that is, she is engaged in a word search activity. Following a 0.9 second silence in line 8, Sev produces the L1 equivalent (°açığa çıkarmak°, tr: ‘to uncover’) of the word she is searching for, which is delivered in soft voice and accompanied with embodied action (see Fig. 5). Note that the gesture (i.e., moving her open hands forward) contributes to semantic information of the missing word (i.e., uncover) and is used as an iconic resource to accomplish mutual understanding in the word search activity. In other words, the embodied completion (Olsher 2004) is performed as a gesture with the open hands moving forward.

After a 0.7 second silence, instead of translating the Turkish expression, T produces a minimal response token (i.e., uh-huh), displaying her understanding that a longer telling is in progress. Initiating her turn with quiet voice in L2 (i.e., °it is important°) followed by a 0.7 second silence, Sev switches back to Turkish to elaborate more on her ideas (lines 13-14). Acknowledging Sev’s response with a soft-voiced and downward ‘°o↓kay°’, T reformulates what Sev has produced in her prior turn in L2 (lines 16-17), which is overlapped with Sev’s repetitive confirmation tokens (i.e., [yeah °yes°). In line 19, with the receipt tokens ‘uh-huh o↓kay’, which can be interpreted as a continuer, displaying that a longer turn is in progress, T gives interactional space (Li and Walsh 2013) to Sev to elaborate more on her ideas. Interestingly, by translating what Sev has uttered in Turkish back to English, T conducts language policing implicitly (Amir 2013; Hazel 2015), thereby re-establishing the prescribed policy which is English in the specific context. Following this implicit other-policing, Sev displays linguistic alignment with T by switching her medium from Turkish to English and expresses her ideas back to in English.

Extract 2 has indicated that disfluencies occur at the initial stage of the searching process, that is, code-switched sequence is projected with silence, hesitation marker (i.e., er: :) and embodied conduct (i.e., opening and closing hands), all of which signal the initiation of forward-oriented repair. Through code-switching, the student orients to the classroom as a shared, interactional space as L1 (i.e., Turkish) is available to all the participants in the classroom, and thus a joint understanding is achieved. By utilizing an iconic gesture (i.e., moving her open hands forward) for the searched-for item (i.e., uncover), the student projects the trajectory of turns-in-progress as well as shows that these gestures are public resources available for all in the classroom. Following the student’s L1 turn, the teacher upholds the L2 mode by translating what has been produced in Turkish into English, which in turn triggers a code-switching behavior from Turkish to English on the part of the student. The teacher does not penalize the L1 use as she orients to the content of student’s turn instead of the linguistic

resources that are used to construct the turn. More precisely, she orients to prioritizing the progressivity of talk rather than pursuing the normativity of institutionally assigned language in the current bilingual classroom. Note that the student achieves linguistic alignment with the teacher through code-switching (from L1 to L2), which shows that there is a commitment among the participants to maintain the medium of instruction in L2. In the upcoming section, we provide two cases of abandonment of the word searches on the part of the teacher.

#### 4.2. Word searches unattended by teacher

The following extract is an example of an unattended word search activity, which illustrates how content is being prioritized over linguistic matters in the current EMI context. The segment begins just after the teacher talked about the famous historical figures in the field of vocational counselling in a plenary teaching.

##### Extract 3: Human resources, 25\_02\_15

01 Esi: when we say vocational coun- counselling we mean† the human  
 02→ resources (0.3) in in the (0.5) 'you know'  
 03 T: +shakes her head  
 04 (0.7)  
 05 T: †no vocation occu†pation (.) i am talking a†bout occupation  
 ((5 lines omitted during which T explains the relationship between vocational  
 counseling and occupation))  
 11 Esi: =since in human resource (.) in human resource-  
 12 T: +nods  
 13 (1.1)  
 14 Esi: re-sour-ces=  
 15 T: =huh huh  
 +nods  
 16→ Esi: er: (0.2) the ca- the the >i don't know< the exact name  
 17→ T: #6 #7



Figure 6

Figure 7

18→ Esi: but the the (.) that person match the person  
 19 with the (0.4) correct (.) position in in the=  
 20 T: +smiles  
 21 T: =uh-huh  
 +smiles and nods  
 22 Esi: er: in the structure of the  
 23 T: uh-huh (.) uh-huh just one part of (0.2) >his or her< job...

In line 1, Esi designs her knowledge gap sequence in declarative syntax which positions herself as less unknowing (Park 2012). Within her turn, she engages in a word search activity which is initiated with a (0.5) second silence and followed by the epistemic marker 'you



know' which receives T's head shake simultaneously. The use of 'you know' should be noted given that it invokes an epistemic symmetry between the speakers. In the institutional context of classroom in which asymmetry between teacher and students is generally obvious, Esi in a way indicates that what she is trying to formulate is something they share in common. T provides an embodied, evaluative response in the form of a headshake at the earliest point when Esi's turn is almost complete; her headshake communicating 'no' implies that vocational counselling does not necessarily mean human resources. Following a 0.7 second silence, T produces a '↑no' response in addressing Esi's knowledge gap and specifies that what she is referring to is 'occupation'. T explains the relationship between vocational counseling and occupation during the omitted 5 lines.

In line 11, by latching T's turn, Esi attempts to formulate her sentence through justification, which is treated with continuers as a longer telling might be in progress. Producing a hesitation marker (i.e., *er:*) followed by a short pause, cut-off and self-repairs, Esi displays trouble coming up with a term for the searched-for item, which becomes more visible with the metalinguistic expression (i.e., *>i don't know< the exact name*). T does not attend to this word search activity and through nodding (see Figs. 6 and 7), she lets Esi continue her turn. In the following turn, as the initiated word search is not oriented to by T, Esi compensates the lack of knowledge through substituting the searched-for word with the distal demonstrative pronoun (Hayashi 2003) 'that person'. Goodwin (1996) calls such communicative placeholders as 'prospective indexicals' as they project the domain of the word in which searched-for item is included. Between lines 20-21, T smiles at Esi when she elaborates on her ideas and the smile seems to be student-oriented which mitigates the mismatch between what Esi is presenting as an idea and what the correct answer is, thus somewhat bypassing the trouble source (Author; Petitjean and González-Martínez 2015). Esi fails to complete her turn when T initiates her turn with the acknowledgement marker (i.e., *uh-huh*) and diverts from the search activity and develops the topic further (line 23).

Extract 3 has demonstrated how a word search activity is unattended as the focus has been on content learning and student participation rather than providing the missing lexical item. The unresolved word search is marked with the teacher's use of continuer (i.e., *uh-huh*), nods and smile in the course of student's explanation that the word searching sequences occurred (Author). In this sense, the example shows that EMI approach has its own peculiar characteristics concerning its context of learning in which participants work with the content, and thus keep the focus on it rather than interrupting the flow of talk at hand. What is also of

interest is that the deployment of certain linguistic resources such as ‘you know’ which invokes a shared knowledge (Asmuss, 2011) and ‘that person’ which indexes a particular domain of word shows that the student engages in compensating the searched-for item in the ongoing search. In so doing, the student utilizes the projective resources while the search is in progress.

Similar to the previous extract, the last example illustrates a case in which the teacher does not orient to the word search activity. Different from Extract 3, the present segment uncovers how recurrent repairs (i.e., on-record other-initiated repairs) are conducted by the teacher in the treatment of a misinterpreted term in the current subject-specific discipline (i.e., Guidance). In this regard, the extract demonstrates how content (i.e., appropriate subject-specific language) is being prioritized over language (i.e., word search) as a reflection of the institutional goal in EMI classrooms. Prior to the extract, the teacher mentioned the features of interpretation skills in a whole-class plenary talk.

**Extract 4: Patient, 15\_04\_15**

01 Fer: hocam may i ask something?  
02 *my teacher*  
{0.5}{T nods}  
03 er: hocam last week we talked about er:  
04 *my teacher*  
summarizing and paraphrasing the {0.3} words that  
+moves her hand forward  
05 the patients told his er:  
06 → {1.0} #8



Figure 8

07 → T: >↑help ee let's say<=  
08 Fer:=yeah  
+nods  
09 → T: not patient  
#9



Figure 9

10 Fer:okay  
+moves her head to both sides  
{0.3}  
12 → T: we don't have any patient  
#10 #11



Figure 10



Figure 11

13 Fer: °okay°  
14 T: °okay°

Fer invokes her intention to ask a question with a self-referencing frame (Clayman and Heritage 2009). Receiving a go-ahead through T nodding, in lines 3 through 5, Fer provides a background context for the upcoming question via a past learning reference (Can Daşkın 2017; Can Daşkın and Hatipoğlu 2019) and the hesitation marker (i.e., er:) projects that Fer has trouble finding a particular word. During the 1.0 second silence in which she shifts her gaze up (see Fig. 8), she makes the word search activity more recognizable and a solitary one by also

assuming a classical “thinking face” (Goodwin and Goodwin 1986), which refers to the facial expression of trying to remember a word. What happens next is that T does not attend to this word search, and instead carries out an on-record correction sequence by repairing the word ‘patient’ produced by Fer. T substitutes the word (i.e., *patient*) with a more discipline-relevant term (i.e., *helpee*), and then provides an inclusive discourse marker (i.e., *let’s say*). It receives an acknowledgement through verbal (i.e., *yeah*) and embodied (i.e., nodding) means from Fer. In line 9, T asserts a stronger claim with the explicit rejection accompanied with nonverbal conduct (i.e., lifting her hand up as a ‘hold on’ position, see Fig. 9). It receives a second acknowledgement by Fer. Following a brief pause, in line 12, T corrects the problematic word ‘patient’ for the third time, in this case via declarative syntax, adding an inclusive pronoun with the embodied behavior of moving her hands up and waving them to both sides (see Figs. 10 and 11). This third repair receives only an acknowledgement marker (i.e., ‘*okay*’) sotto voce from Fer and following this, the same quiet ‘*okay*’ is produced by T.

Extract 4 has illustrated how a word search activity is not oriented to by the teacher as instead of providing the missing word, she conducts recurrent repairs on the misinterpreted content, i.e., the distinction between ‘patient’ and ‘helpee’ in counselling context. In this sense, the teacher’s exposed repairs on the miscomprehended content rather than orientation to the ongoing word search activity demonstrate that the teacher prioritizes content over language, thereby uncovering reparative organizations in EMI classrooms which focus on content learning. The teacher uses positioning in the classroom (i.e., orienting back and forth to the student) along with gesture (i.e., holding her hand up) and gaze in order to orient to the student whose contribution she is evaluating and transforming into discipline-specific language. Revealing the complexity of EMI practices, the current example illustrates how the teacher takes up the interactional resources for doing the correction on the misguided content (i.e., using the term ‘patient’ instead of ‘helpee’) rather than resolving an emergent word search.

In conclusion, the analyses provide insights into how the participants construct the language policy of EMI in and through interaction (Extracts 1 and 2). We do this by investigating word searches, detailing the roles and the division of labor between L1 and L2 in EMI interaction. L1 is being used by the students as a means to resolve word searches, but in these cases, it is not marked as the primary alternative. Students’ explicit orientation to word searching activity shows that they employ a variety of resources to initiate a word search and extend an invitation for co-participation. In this sense, it demonstrates how such activity is co-constructed with the

students' public display of their relevant actions. Importantly, the way the teacher orients to these student-initiated word search activities demonstrates that the teacher does not approve code-switching behavior, thereby maintaining the officially assigned classroom language. The analyses also shed light on teachers' orientation to the meaning of the student turn rather than searched-for items (Extracts 3 and 4). Students may display a knowledge gap for a word in the L2, but the teacher does not orient to this knowledge gap as something that should be attended to; rather, she orients to the progress of the ongoing activity or problems concerning the subject-specific content under focus.

### 5. Discussion and conclusion

This paper has explored a pedagogical setting where English is being used and is institutionally defined as the language of interaction even though all the participants share another L1 (i.e., Turkish). Thus, the setting is very similar to CLIL classrooms (e.g., Jakonen 2016, 2018; Nikula, Dafouz, Moore and Smit 2016), but while CLIL takes place in schools and involves only certain subjects forming a bilingual program, the EMI pedagogy is implemented at the university level and involves the whole curriculum. However, even if the whole university programme has been defined as monolingual English (METU Online, Information on the medium of instruction), the analysis of the data shows that the interactional reality of the learning situations is more varied. The context in which the current study was situated lends itself well to the use of bilingual resources since the students and the teacher have resources both in English and in their L1, Turkish, and thus use the whole range of their multilingual potential when performing actions and managing the classroom interaction. This can be seen, for example, in instances where the students encounter problems formulating their turns in English; such word search sequences are a typical environment for the occurrence of words or longer stretches of talk in L1.

We have investigated word search sequences as a lens through which the tacit assumptions and norms within an EMI classroom situation can be illustrated. As we have shown, the students use resources from their L1 while constructing their turns in classroom interaction without being sanctioned by the teacher in any way. Nevertheless, it is clear that the transition from the L2 to the L1 is interactionally marked both by the students and the teacher. In Extract 1, the L1 equivalent of the searched-for item is immediately followed by laughter both from the student [himself](#) and [the rest of the students in](#) the class [\(but not the teacher\)](#), [which illustrates how the students deal with this breach \(i.e., the issue of preferred language choice in the current institutional setting\) and use laughter as a regulatory resource after breaching language rules \(Vöge, 2011\), and thus achieve affiliation \(for a similar argument, see](#)

[Author](#)). In this sense, the extract describes how bilingualism and the institutional norms of the current educational setting generate a resource for laughter, which frames the interaction as delicate (Jefferson, 1985), and the use of immediate translation practice by the teacher does the interactional work to keep the two languages (i.e., Turkish and English) apart by conveying to the student that his language choice is not the appropriate medium of interaction, that is, the L1 is not treated as a legitimate resource (Jakonen et al. 2018). In this sense, participants mark the transition from one language to another through interactional resources (i.e., laughter, translational work) to point to the problematic nature of this type of language alternation.

Even if a lexical problem has emerged, the students display an orientation to use English rather than Turkish, and thus orient to L2 being the normative language choice in whole-class interaction. The student makes an effort (i.e., speech perturbations, explicit search marker, silences, embodied practices), which projects the imminent code-switching (Morton and Evnitskaya 2018) to find the missing word in English in the ongoing talk. To illustrate, the formulaic expression ‘how can I say?’ implies that the student is not searching for a word that has slipped his mind, but for a way to complete his sentence in English, i.e., how to say it (Seo and Koshik 2012). It is not until the teacher indicates, both gesturally and verbally (lines 11-12), a transition to proceed in the conversation, when the student switches to his L1. In other words, using L1 is the ‘last choice’ for the student; he resorts to Turkish only when he notices that the teacher is about to move on, and his search may remain unresolved. It should be noted that the student is persistent in finding the exact word he is searching for even if the teacher demonstrates that intersubjectivity (i.e., reformulation in line 8) has been accomplished (Seo and Koshik 2012). This finding demonstrates that it is the student himself to accept or reject the solution offered by the teacher as he is the agent who knows for sure what he is pursuing in the ongoing word search sequence even if a display of sufficient intersubjective understanding is established by the teacher in order to continue the ongoing talk.

Students may also use L1 as a way to manage their turns in the public sphere of classroom interaction along with the deployment of the iconic gestures that enhance projectability and specificity of the searched-for word (Hayashi 2003). In Extract 2, gestures are used during the course of the word search in an effort to fill in the lexical gap and probably to elicit the searched-for item from the teacher (Seo 2008). The student uses L1 to resolve a word search in a soft voice, the lower volume is more likely to be a sign of private talk (Lin 2014), thereby marking the use of the L1 in the current EMI setting. Instead of translating the Turkish expression, the teacher displays understanding and encourages continuation through discourse particles (line 10). The student, however, does not consider the search as completed

when her turn has not been verbalized in the official language, English. She recycles the beginning of her search and continues describing the content more substantially in Turkish. This turn is responded to by the teacher's explanation in English. Hence, by switching to her L1, the student manages to get more attention and a more substantial response to her turn; after the student's switch to Turkish, the teacher formulates the gist of the turn in English, thereby displaying the student's contribution for the public sphere of the classroom, engaging in multilogue (Schwab 2011).

It is evident that even though students can use their L1 in EMI classrooms, they do not use it as an equal alternative to English; talk in L1 has specific functions in classroom interaction. By switching to their L1, the students may navigate within the IRF-sequences (Mehan 1979; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975), securing their opportunities to participate in the classroom discussion and getting their contributions legitimized. Moreover, "the students manifest their conception of the classroom as a bilingual space through their code-switching practices" (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Caine 2005, p. 245) as shared understanding is not jeopardized through the use of L1 resources.

From the students' point of view, one function of using L1 utterances may be to enlarge their linguistic repertoire in English. When encountering a lexical problem in their L2, the students are able to indicate which utterance is missing by providing it in their L1. It is worth noting that the teacher, however, does not orient to the word searches as signals of lexical gaps that need to be filled. The teacher does not treat the L1 words as something that need special attention: instead of providing the searched-for element, she embeds the L2 equivalent in her next turn, or she just displays understanding. In other words, the teacher orients to the content of the students' turns, not to the linguistic resources that are used to construct the turns. This is even more evident in the second set of examples (i.e., unattended word searches in Extracts 3 and 4), where the students are involved in search sequences without providing elements in their L1. Even though the students attempt to find a certain word or expression in English, the teacher's response focuses not on the missing lexical element but on some other issue, e.g., the progressivity of the interaction, or potential deficiencies in the content of the turn. By so doing, the teacher displays orientation to the meaning rather than to the form of the students' utterances; the primary activity is the joint knowledge-construction, and the linguistic means to perform this activity are treated as instrumental rather than as a learning object.

In sum, the students' word search sequences in an EMI classroom display how the participants construct the language policy of EMI in and through interaction, enacting a multilingual pedagogy that treats all available languages as resources (see also Jakonen 2018).

Both the students and the teacher treat English as the default language in the interaction, but while the students can make relevant their limited resources in English, the teacher avoids focusing on these limitations. The institutional fingerprint of EMI is reflected on the teacher's orientation to what can be topicalized and made as learnable in the shared classroom talk – the important thing is what the students say rather than how they say it. In light of these findings, we argue that word searches should be explored as highly situated practices even though they have similar features across languages. The interactional consequences of language alternation in the course of a word search in bilingual educational settings should be reconsidered in order to provide a holistic view of classroom realities (i.e., the discrepancy between policy and practice), especially in EMI settings where there is a top-down language policy. Furthermore, selection of these cases should be integrated in in-service EMI teacher education programmes and teachers' awareness on language use should be raised (see Author). Although our data speaks to institutional norms regarding language use, i.e., a monolingual English instructional medium in the institutional context of content-focused classrooms, the applications are broader for multilingual interactional encounters in which conversational activities (i.e., word searches and code-switching) are accomplished through distinctive mediums of interaction.

#### Appendix: Transcription conventions

(1.8)	Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate a pause. The number represents the number of seconds of duration of the pause, to one decimal place. A pause of less than 0.2 seconds is marked by (.)
[ ]	Brackets around portions of utterances show that those portions overlap with a portion of another speaker's utterance.
=	An equal sign is used to show that there is no time lapse between the portions connected by the equal signs. This is used where a second speaker begins their utterance just at the moment when the first speaker finishes.
::	A colon after a vowel or a word is used to show that the sound is extended. The number of colons shows the length of the extension.
(hm, hh)	These are onomatopoeic representations of the audible exhalation of air)
.hh	This indicates an audible inhalation of air, for example, as a gasp. The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
?	A question mark indicates that there is slightly rising intonation.
.	A period indicates that there is slightly falling intonation.
,	A comma indicates a continuation of tone.
-	A dash indicates an abrupt cut off, where the speaker stopped speaking suddenly.
↑↓	Up or down arrows are used to indicate that there is sharply rising or falling intonation. The arrow is placed just before the syllable in which the change in intonation occurs.
<u>Under</u>	Underlines indicate speaker emphasis on the underlined portion of the word.
CAPS	Capital letters indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalized portion of the utterance at a higher volume than the speaker's normal volume.
°	This indicates an utterance that is much softer than the normal speech of the speaker. This symbol will appear at the beginning and at the end of the utterance in question.
><, <>	'Greater than' and 'less than' signs indicate that the talk they surround was noticeably faster, or slower than the surrounding talk.



(would)	When a word appears in parentheses, it indicates that the transcriber has guessed as to what was said, because it was indecipherable on the tape. If the transcriber was unable to guess what was said, nothing appears within the parentheses.
\$C'mon\$	Dollar signs are used to indicate a smiley or jokey voice.
→	Highlights point of analysis.
+	Marks the onset of an embodied action (e.g. shift of gaze, pointing).
(( ))	Describes embodied actions within a specific turn and time.
#	Refers to onset of the figure.

## References

Author

Author

Author

Author

Author

Author

Authors

- Ahlsén, E. (1985). *Discourse patterns in aphasia*. Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics 5. Gothenburg: Department of Linguistics, University of Gothenburg.
- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73 (4), 561-576.
- Amir, A. (2013). Self-policing in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 7 (2), 84-105.
- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: Micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4 (2), 151-167.
- Asmuss, B. (2011). Proposing shared knowledge as a means of pursuing agreement. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 207-234). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Belhiah, H., & Elhami, M. (2015). English as a medium of instruction in the Gulf: When students and teachers speak. *Language Policy*, 14 (1), 3-23.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534-545.
- Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1 (2), 81-99.
- Can Daşkın, N. (2017). *A conversation analytic study of reference to a past learning event in L2 classroom interaction: Implications for informal formative assessment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Can Daşkın, N., & Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2019). Reference to a past learning event in teacher turns in an L2 instructional setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 142, 16-30.
- Chiarenza, A. C. (2010). *Word searches in L1 and L2 Italian conversation: Re-establishing intersubjectivity*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2009). Question design as a comparative and historical window

- into president-press relations. In M. Haakana, M. Laakso & J. Lindström (Eds.), *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions* (pp. 299-315). Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Copp Jinkerson, A. (2011). Interpreting and managing a monolingual norm in an English-speaking class in Finland: When first and second graders contest the norm. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5 (1), 27-48.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ekman, P. (1999). Emotional and conversational nonverbal signals. In L. S. Messing & R. Campbell (Eds.), *Gesture, speech and sign* (pp. 45-55). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Funayama, I. (2002). Word-searches in cross-linguistic settings: Teaching learning collaboration between native and non-native speakers. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction and Culture*, 4, 33-57.
- Greer, T. (2008). Accomplishing difference in bilingual interaction: Translation as backwards-oriented medium-repair. *Multilingua*, 27 (1), 99-127.
- Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 100-117.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. (1986). Gesture and co-participation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62 (1), 51-75.
- Gynne, A. (2019). 'English or Swedish please, no Dari!'—(trans) languaging and language policing in upper secondary school's language introduction programme in Sweden. *Classroom Discourse*, 10 (3-4), 347-368.
- Hadar, U. (1991). Speech-related body movement in aphasia: Period analysis of upper arms and head movement. *Brain and Language*, 42, 339-366.
- Hadar, U., & Butterworth, B. (1997). Iconic gestures, imagery and word retrieval in speech. *Semiotica*, 115, 147-172.
- Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36, 109-141.
- Hazel, S. (2015). Identities at odds: Embedded and implicit language policing in the internationalized workplace. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15 (1), 141-160.
- Helasvuo, M., Laakso, M., & Sorjonen, M. (2004). Searching for words: Syntactic and sequential construction of word search in conversations of Finnish speakers with aphasia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37, 1-37.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (1), 25-50.
- Jakonen, T. (2016). 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. (2018). The environment of a bilingual classroom as an interactional resource. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 20-30.
- Jakonen, T., Szabó, T. P., & Laihonen, P. (2018). Translanguaging as playful subversion of a monolingual norm in the classroom. In M. Gerardo (Ed.), *Translanguaging as everyday practice* (pp. 31-48). Switzerland: Springer.
- Jefferson, G. (1985). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In J. Atkinson learners. *Text & Talk*, 32, 167-189.
- Lee, J. H., & Macaro, E. (2013). Investigating age in the use of L1 or English-only instruction:

- Vocabulary acquisition by Korean EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97 (4), 887-901.
- Lerner, G. (1996). On the “semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O’Caine, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89 (2), 234-247.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance, and codeswitching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 49-84.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2005). Critical, transdisciplinary perspectives on language-in-education policy and practice in postcolonial contexts: The case of Hong Kong. In A. M. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 38–54). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lin, A. M. Y., & Wu, Y. (2015). “May I speak Cantonese?” Co-constructing a scientific proof in an EFL junior secondary science classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18, 289-305.
- Lin, F. (2014). *A conversation-analytic study of word searches in EFL classrooms*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Newcastle University, UK.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51 (1), 36-76.
- Macaro, E., Tian, L., & Chu, L. (2018). First and second language use in English medium instruction contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-21.
- Malabarba, T. (2019). ‘In English, sorry’: Participants’ orientation to the English-only policy in beginning-level EFL classroom interaction. *Conversation analytic perspectives on English language learning, teaching and testing in global contexts*, 244.
- Malmstrom, H., Mezek, S., Pecorari, D., Shaw, P., & Irvine, A. (2017). Engaging with terminology in the multilingual classroom: Teachers’ practices for bridging the gap between L1 lectures and English reading. *Classroom Discourse*, 8, 3-18.
- McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind*. Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- METU. Language of instruction. <http://www.metu.edu.tr/general-information>
- Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47 (1), 65-94.
- Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (2), 195-219.
- Morton, T. (2015). Vocabulary explanations in CLIL classrooms: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning Journal*, 43 (3), 256-270.
- Morton, T., & Evnitskaya, N. (2011). Knowledge construction, meaning-making and interaction in CLIL science classroom communities of practice. *Language and Education*, 25 (2), 109-127.
- Morton, T., & Evnitskaya, N. (2018). Language alternation in peer interaction in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). In A. Filipi & N. Markee (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and language alternation: Capturing transitions in the classroom* (pp. 61-82). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Nikula, T. (2007). Speaking English in Finnish content-based classrooms. *World Englishes*,

26 (2), 206-223.

- Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P., & Smit, U. (Eds.) (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221-245). Continuum, London.
- Park, I. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 7 (2). Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Park, I. (2012). Asking different types of polar questions: The interplay between turn, sequence, and context in writing conferences. *Discourse Studies*, 14 (5), 613-633.
- Petitjean, C., & González-Martínez, E. (2015). Laughing and smiling to manage trouble in French-language classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 6 (2), 89-102.
- Radford, J. (2009). Word searches: On the use of verbal and non-verbal resources during classroom talk. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 23 (8), 598-610.
- Schegloff, E. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-288). Academic Press, New York.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53 (2), 361-382.
- Schwab, G. (2011). From dialogue to multilogue: A different view on participation in the English foreign-language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 2 (1), 3-19.
- Seo, M. (2008). *A conversational-analytic study of repair practices in one-on-one ESL tutoring*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.
- Siegel, A. (2016). *Longitudinal development of word search sequences in English as a lingua franca interaction*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Newcastle: Newcastle University.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43 (1), 3-31.
- Svennevig, J. (2018). "What's it called in Norwegian?" Acquiring L2 vocabulary items in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 126, 68-77.
- [Vöge, M. \(2011\). Employing multilingualism for doing identity work and generating laughter in business meetings: A case study. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner \(Eds.\), L2 learning as a social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives \(pp. 237-264\). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.](#)
- Wei, L., & Lin, A. M. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, 10 (3-4), 209-215.