

**WAYS OF TALKING HALKOMELEM:
INTERACTION IN CLASSROOM PROCEDURAL TALK**
by

Susan M. Russell
M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1997

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
Special Arrangements
in the
Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences

© Susan Russell 2009

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2009

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Susan M. Russell

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Title of Thesis: "Ways of Talking Halkomelem: Interaction in classroom procedural talk"

Examining Committee:

Dean of Graduate Studies or Designate

Dr. J. Dean Mellow, Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor, Linguistics

Dr. Marianne Ignace, Supervisor
Associate Professor, Anthropology

Dr. Kelleen Toohey, Supervisor
Professor, Education

Dr. William Turnbull, Supervisor
Professor, Psychology

Dr. Suzanne Hilgendorf, Examiner
Associate Professor, Psychology

Dr. Jon Reyhner, External Examiner
Professor, Education, Northern Arizona University

Date Approved:

2 July 2009



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <www.lib.sfu.ca> at: <<http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada

STATEMENT OF ETHICS APPROVAL

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

(a) Human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

(b) Advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

(c) as a co-investigator, collaborator or research assistant in a research project approved in advance,

or

(d) as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

The dissertation is an empirical report of the language used in four different types of classrooms (language review, language immersion, linguistics, mentoring) in which one dialect of the endangered Salish language Halkomelem was being taught and learned. A conversation analysis approach was used to examine the interactional patterns of turn-taking and repair by the different participants (elders, instructors, students, researcher) while they were engaged in two types of procedural talk: setting up (and repairing) procedure, and doing a justification of the task and the procedure.

One primary finding is that consensus on what is provisionally target-like, or useable, rests upon a co-present elder taking a critical role in the classroom process. Learner access to the elder is reflected in varying amounts and complexity of learner target language use.

Consequently, participants have adapted some usual classroom interactional choices of turn-taking and repair that reflect the particular constraints and challenges of an endangered language context, and facilitate using the available resources. The most obvious of these are interactional adaptations to the usual classroom patterns of Initiation-Response-Evaluation, teacher (procedural) monologues, and to the usual power relations between teachers and students in other types of language learning classrooms. These adaptations reflect differing claims to ownership over specialized knowledge about Halkomelem.

Another finding is the extensive work by participants to justify specific learning activities or target forms of the language. This work reflects some unique constraints of teaching and learning an endangered language.

Overall, procedural talk is found to provide one context for quasi-conversational interaction.

Subject words: conversation analysis; interaction analysis in education; oral communication; endangered languages; second language acquisition

Keywords: turn taking and repair; classroom interaction in Halkomelem, procedural classroom talk; doing a justification; language output complexity

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to all the people working to learn and teach Halkomelem and other Aboriginal languages in BC today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I owe my gratitude to the learners, teachers and program managers of the Shxweli. I honour their work and dedication and I raise my hands to them all. I also thank the Shxweli for the opportunity over the years to know and to work in some small way with two outstanding knowers of the language: Yamelot and Tsetselexwot. These women gave so much to the language, to people in the community and academics outside and are inspirations to all of us.

I cherish the time I was able to work with Siyemiyeteliyot. I thank her for her warmth, her knowledge, her cultural teachings and her personal friendship. I honour her for the critical contribution her teaching and knowledge continue to make to the ongoing health of this language and the Halkomelem communities. I thank her above all for the opportunity to witness her mentoring work and for what I hope may be learned from it.

I thank Ethel Gardiner for the chance to work with her in setting up and then teaching a class she arranged through the SFU Education faculty to support ongoing maintenance for graduates of the community-run immersion classes. I also thank Tl'owkomot for her endless support and the wonderful welcome to work in her class.

In the course of doing this research I have been supported by so many people. I have appreciated discussions with Laura Wee Lay Laq, Strang Burton, as well as the chance again for ongoing debriefings with Ilona Feher, Mercedes Hinkson and Ed Cook. I am delighted again for help from thesis experts Sheilagh MacDonald and Carol Jackson and formatting whiz Zoey Peterson.

In writing the dissertation I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to work with scholars from a variety of fields. Kelleen Toohey in Education supported and enabled me to explore some philosophical and practical questions in educational theorizing as they pertain to learning endangered languages. I have enjoyed about ten years of collegial discussions with Marianne Ignace as we have worked together in the SFU/Kamloops Program. I have benefited immeasurably from her experience, her insights as an anthropologist and her skills as a practical linguist. Bill Turnbull provided critical intellectual guidance and personal support. He opened the potential of the field

of conversation analysis to me as an undergraduate. His influence nagged at me through other graduate work, into work on endangered languages with communities and finally into the methodology and findings of this research. It wouldn't have happened without him. Jon Reyhner helped clarify some critical conclusions to the thesis as did Suzanne Hilgendorf as well as valuable edits. Meanwhile, Dean Mellow in Linguistics has provided untiring and exhaustive support to the process of producing a dissertation. I don't know if I owe him more thanks or apologies for persuading him to take on guiding this rather unwieldy cross-disciplinary project through to completion, but thank him I do for his continuing grace under pressure, amazing attention to detail and the years of reading and rereading drafts that only a senior advisor would endure. To all of you: *tseł sxwoxwelches*.

To my daughters, son-in-laws and grandbabies, thanks for your amazing interest and support. And finally, once again and always, thank you John.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xii
Glossary	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background: Witnessing	1
1.2 The research focus	2
1.2.1 Procedural talk: A specific type of classroom talk.....	3
1.2.2 Relevance of the research	6
Chapter 2: A Theoretical Perspective	7
2.1 Second language learning: A theoretical perspective.....	7
2.2 An interactionist model: Co-constructing meaning.....	9
2.3 Analytic procedures of the research.....	14
2.3.1 Using CA Methodology.....	14
2.3.1.1 Turn taking.....	16
2.3.1.2 Adjacency pairs	20
2.3.1.3 Repair	21
2.3.1.4 Intersubjectivity.....	23
2.4 Seedhouse's model	26
2.4.1 Institutional discourse.....	26
2.4.2 Seedhouse challenges the communicative approach.....	29
2.4.3 Seedhouse's findings.....	31
2.4.3.1 Form and accuracy	31
2.4.3.2 Meaning and fluency	32
2.4.3.3 Task oriented	32
2.4.3.4 Procedural context.....	33
2.5 Analytic categories from the data: Seedhouse adapted	33
2.6 Summary	38
Chapter 3: The Methodology and the Program	40
3.1 The Program	40
3.1.1 The participants.....	40
3.1.2 The elders.....	41
3.1.3 The instructors/teachers	42
3.1.4 The students.....	43
3.1.5 The researcher.....	43

3.2	The language classes and data set.....	44
3.2.1	The language of Upriver Halkomelem: A brief sketch.....	47
3.2.1.1	The sound system and morphophonemics	48
3.2.1.2	The morphology.....	48
3.3	The Research.....	49
3.3.1	The research questions.....	49
3.3.2	The research method	50
3.3.3	The research focus #1: The analytic linguistic categories.....	51
3.3.4	The research focus #2: Interactional patterns of language production	52
Chapter 4: Procedural Focus		54
4.1	Introduction.....	54
4.2	Language Review (LR) classes and procedural talk	54
4.2.1	Procedural language output: Analysis	54
4.2.2	Interaction in LR: Data examples and description by class	57
4.2.2.1	LR Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples	57
4.2.2.2	LR Classes #2 and #3, (November 10 & 17): Description and examples	61
4.2.3	Turn-taking in procedural context in LR classes.....	66
4.2.4	Repair in procedural context in LR classes.....	69
4.2.5	Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in LR	71
4.3	Language Immersion classes and procedural talk	73
4.3.1	Procedural language output: Analysis	73
4.3.2	Interaction in LI: Data examples and description by class.....	77
4.3.2.1	LI Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples	77
4.3.2.2	LI Class #2, (October 3): Description and examples	78
4.3.2.3	LI Class #3, (October 4): Description and examples	80
4.3.3	Turn-taking in procedural context in LI classes	82
4.3.4	Repair in procedural context in LI classes	85
4.3.5	Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in LI classes	87
4.4	Linguistics classes and procedural talk	89
4.4.1	Procedural language output: Analysis	89
4.4.2	Interaction in Linguistics classes: Data examples and description	90
4.4.2.1	Linguistics Class #1, (February 11): Description and examples	90
4.4.3	Turn-taking in procedural talk in Linguistics classes	93
4.4.4	Repair in procedural talk in Linguistics classes	95
4.4.5	Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in Linguistics classes	95
4.5	Mentoring session and procedural talk	96
4.5.1	Procedural language output: Analysis	96
4.5.2	Interaction in mentoring: Data examples and description.....	98
4.5.3	Turn-taking in procedural context in the mentoring session	103
4.5.4	Repair in procedural context in a mentoring session.....	105
4.5.5	Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in a mentoring session.....	106
4.6	Summary and conclusion: Turn-taking and repair in procedural context	107
Chapter 5: Doing a Justification		110
5.1	Introduction.....	110
5.2	Language Review (LR) classes and doing a justification.....	110
5.2.1	Language output doing a justification in LR classes.....	110
5.2.2	Interaction in LR: data examples and description by class.....	113
5.2.2.1	LR Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples	113
5.2.2.2	LR Class #2, (November 10): Description and examples	122
5.2.3	Turn-taking in doing a justification in LR classes.....	123

5.2.4	Repair in doing a justification in LR classes.....	126
5.2.4.1	Learner asks for elder to verify target form.....	130
5.2.4.2	Intonation cue.....	130
5.2.4.3	Mitigated repair by elder.....	130
5.2.4.4	Explicit negative evaluation by elder.....	131
5.2.4.5	Explicit repair by elder: specify the error.....	131
5.2.4.6	Defer to authority of elder.....	131
5.2.4.7	Elder recasts repairable.....	131
5.2.5	Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in LR classes.....	132
5.3	Language Immersion (LI) classes and doing a justification.....	132
5.3.1	Language output doing a justification in LI classes.....	133
5.3.2	Interaction in LI: Data examples and description by class.....	135
5.3.2.1	LI Class #1, (September 26): Description and examples.....	135
5.3.2.2	LI Class #2 (October 3): Description and examples.....	140
5.3.2.3	LI Class #3 (October 1): Description and example.....	141
5.3.3	Turn-taking in doing a justification in LI classes.....	142
5.3.4	Repair in doing a justification in LI classes.....	144
5.3.5	Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in LI classes.....	146
5.4	Linguistics classes and doing a justification.....	146
5.4.1	Language output doing a justification in Linguistics classes.....	147
5.4.2	Interaction in Linguistics classes: Data examples and description by class.....	148
5.4.3	Turn-taking and doing a justification in Linguistics classes.....	153
5.4.4	Repair in doing a justification in Linguistics classes.....	155
5.4.4.1	Teacher references previous elicitation time with elder.....	157
5.4.4.2	Teacher asks elder directly.....	158
5.4.4.3	Teacher calls for more research.....	158
5.4.5	Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in Linguistics classes.....	158
5.5	Mentoring session and doing a justification.....	159
5.5.1	Language output doing a justification in a mentoring session.....	159
5.5.2	Interaction in Mentoring in doing a justification: Data examples and description.....	160
5.5.3	Turn-taking in doing a justification in a mentoring session.....	164
5.5.4	Repair in doing a justification in a mentoring session.....	166
5.5.4.1	Ask directly: how do you say X?.....	167
5.5.4.2	Recast and echo production.....	167
5.5.4.3	Clarification question.....	167
5.5.4.4	Demur/avoid.....	168
5.5.5	Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in a mentoring session.....	168
5.6	Discussion and conclusion: Turn-taking and repair in doing a justification.....	169
Chapter 6: Summary and Pedagogical Implications.....		171
6.1	Introduction.....	171
6.2	Summary of research findings.....	172
6.3	Other issues arising out of the data.....	174
6.3.1	A comparison with Seedhouse's model.....	175
6.3.2	The role of pragmatics.....	175
6.3.3	The role of L1.....	176
6.3.4	Practical teaching strategies.....	176
6.4	Postscript: Some implications for Halkomelem, its learners, linguists and communities.....	178
6.4.1	Program choices.....	178

6.4.2	The role of linguists and linguistics	179
6.4.3	Future possibilities.....	181
Reference List	185

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR September 22 class	55
Figure 4.2: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR November 10 class	56
Figure 4.3: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR November 17 class	56
Figure 4.4: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus in mentoring.....	97
Figure 5.1: Emergence of a construction in LR class, September 22.	112
Figure 5.2: Types of target language utterances in LI classes, doing a justification	134
Figure 5.3: Types of target language utterances in Linguistics classes in doing a justification	148
Figure 5.4: Types of target language utterances in doing a justification, Mentoring	160

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1:	Language classes used in the analysis	45
Table 4.1:	Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in LR classes.....	55
Table 4.2:	Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in LR classes	67
Table 4.3:	Repair characteristics of procedural talk in LR classes	69
Table 4.4:	Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in LI classes.....	74
Table 4.5:	Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in LI classes	83
Table 4.6:	Repair characteristics of procedural talk in LI classes.....	86
Table 4.7:	Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in mentoring.....	97
Table 5.1:	Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification in LR classes. Note: Because the elder was reading out student work, the asterisks (*) indicate that some clauses were non-target-like.	111
Table 5.2:	Turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification using L2 in LR classes. Note: The following abbreviations are used in this table: FOF= focus on form, L2C= target language construction, DAJ= do a justification, C-repair= construction repair, J-repair= justification (pragmatic) repair, S= student, E= elder.	124
Table 5.3:	Repair in doing a justification using L2 in LR classes:	127
Table 5.4:	Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification in LI classes	133

GLOSSARY

Conventional CA symbols for transcribing speech

[previous talk and overlapping talk
[talk latched onto previous talk with no gap
=	brief pause measured in seconds
(2.5)	brief unmeasured pause
(.)	missing turns in the transcription
...	word cut off
wo-	sudden pitch (and volume) increase
↑	sudden pitch (and volume) decrease
↓	louder volume than surrounding speech
CAPITALS	slight rise in intonation, suggests continuation
,	falling intonation, suggests completion
.	rising intonation (not necessarily a question)
?	surprise or animation
!	a lengthened vowel or syllable
e:	whispered speech
◦	speech faster than previous speech
> <	speech slower than previous speech
< >	transcriber's guess as to the speech enclosed
(word)	unintelligible speech
(xx)	audible inbreath
(.h)	audible outbreath
(h)	non-linguistic utterances or actions
((laughter, cough))	participant name omitted
(Name)	sound of CD ROM
((bling))	

CA and other terminology

All	students participating in the conversation	All
CA	Conversation Analysis	
CD	Compact Disc (playing language samples)	
CFNLP	Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency	
H	Halkomelem	
LR	Language Review	
LI	Language Immersion	
IRE/IRF	Initiation-response evaluation/initiation-response feedback	
L1	first language	
L2	second language or target language	
S	unidentified learner	
S1	identified learner	
Ss	multiple learners	

e.o.	everyone
SLA	second language acquisition
SFU	Simon Fraser University
E	elder
SR	Susan Russell (participant in classroom)
T	teacher/instructor
TCU	Turn Construction Unit
TRP	Turn Relevance Place
repairable	bit of language that speakers recognize as causing them trouble
S-I S-R	self-initiated self-repair
S-I O-R	self-initiated other-repair
O-I S-R	other-initiated self-repair
O-I O-R	other-initiated other-repair
Abbreviations in morpheme glosses	
aux.	auxiliary
det.	determiner
Su.	subject
Sbrd.	subordinate
tr.	transitive
nom.	nominalizer
1p	first person
poss.	possessive

The orthography

e	schwa (or various allophones)
o	low back unrounded vowel
x	voiceless velar fricative palatalized
xw	voiceless velar fricative rounded
ɣ	voiceless uvular fricative
ɣw	voiceless uvular fricative rounded
q	voiceless uvular stop
qw	voiceless uvular stop rounded
q'	glottalic uvular stop
q'w	glottalic uvular stop rounded
lh	voiceless lateral fricative
tl'	voiceless lateral glottalic affricate

Translations from Halkomelem to English

Within the conversational excerpts, translations are provided in three ways: (a) at the right margin of the page, with the original Halkomelem in italics, (b) with morpheme glosses and translations below a longer utterance, or (c) with just a gloss below, depending on the focus of the analysis. Single brackets enclose the transcriber's best guess of an utterance as well as non-target Halkomelem L2 utterances, as in the word *sel*, *T'*, (i.e., the non-target form of *tsel*).

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background: Witnessing

This dissertation is about how people are talking in interaction in one dialect of Halkomelem in one language program in one community of British Columbia. The dissertation is also about how I witnessed this talking and became a participant. The thesis also reflects on how the ways in which we all interacted were related to the kinds of language being spoken and heard in a number of kinds of classroom settings.

Halkomelem is one of many Aboriginal languages in western Canada that is endangered. The community in this report is one of the communities where I have worked, have visited people who are working to revitalize their languages, and have witnessed to some extent their struggle. In addition to two dialects of Halkomelem, the other languages that I had worked with in British Columbia at the time of my research included Haida, Gitksan, Sm7algyax, Heiltsuk, Nuxalk, Tsilhqut'in, Dakelh (Carrier), Secwepemctsin, St'at'imcets, and Ucwalmicwts, as well as Northern Tutchone in the Yukon. These languages belong to four language families and one isolate and are just a small subset of the huge linguistic diversity of this province (Kroeber, 1999; Mithun, 1999).

The names of these languages evoke the intellectual history of the area within Canada of the Northwest Coast and some of the BC Interior. Their areas extend from northern Yukon to Haida Gwaii; from the North Coast around Old Hazelton, west to Prince Rupert and down to Hartley Bay; from Bella Bella to Bella Coola; and from the Chilcotin and Carrier communities around Anaham Lake to Williams Lake, and south to Lillooet and Mount Currie. Their areas also include the Shuswap region from Williams Lake to Kamloops, north to Barrier and east of Chase toward the Okanagan. Finally and importantly, the areas of these Aboriginal languages include the lower mainland of British Columbia near Vancouver, where there were no resident native speakers left for the Katzie dialect of Halkomelem and with only three native speakers available for the Upriver dialect at the time of research (see section 3.2.1).

All of these Aboriginal languages are recognized as endangered (Assembly of First Nations, 1990, 1992;¹ Cook, 1998; Kinkade, 1991; Krauss, 1997; Mithun, 1999). The people in all of these communities recognize that, without critical intervention, very soon no native speakers will be left. This situation is a critical threat to the integrity and even existence of these languages, as well as a concomitant threat to the intellectual, philosophical, cultural and artistic ways of expression of these peoples (Fishman, 1991; Hinton, 2001; Ignace, 1998; Mithun, 1999, p. 2). Responses to this threat vary widely, but in all of these communities there is some kind of concerted effort to focus attention on the need to produce a new generation of speakers to carry on the social, cultural, spiritual and intellectual bases of knowledge represented through these Aboriginal languages. Some communities are attempting to marshal the last speakers, support new learners, and involve some interested outside expertise. Other communities have achieved inspirational programs that have produced recognized leaders in the language revitalization movement.

Chiefs, councillors and community members publically state that they support and desire efforts that revitalize Aboriginal languages.² Community members also generally state positive attitudes toward learning and using Aboriginal languages (Barrett, 2007). The reality of actual use, however, is different. Most learning and use happen in language-learning classroom situations with little opportunity for genuine immersion in a community of speakers. The language is not often heard outside such classrooms.³ Many classes are currently limited in scope and content.⁴ Consequently, considerable disappointment has resulted from this mis-match between perceived needs and the apparent outcomes of language revitalization efforts.

1.2 The research focus

It is important to recognize and honour stated attitudes. However, before we can explain and repair the gap between stated goals and the precipitous decline in actual

¹ AFN recognized two B.C. languages as 'enduring' (i.e. having over 60% fluent adult speakers) (Ignace, 1998, p. 12).

² This was corroborated by various participants at the International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, July, 2007.

³ Speakers in some communities use some ritualized language in long-house winter ceremonies, not included in this study.

⁴ Pye (1992, p. 77) observed that Chilcotin parents 'teach' their children Chilcotin through "numbers, colours and a few basic nouns". Although this reflects many classroom observations, Dicker et al. (2009, p. 156) note that 'earlier lessons (in Inuttitut) focused mostly on naming animals, telling time and learning the writing system'.

use, it is also important to document empirically the language that is actually being used and the contexts in which it is used. This dissertation provides a detailed report of the language that is being produced in classrooms. It also reports what people are doing together to produce that language. The dissertation attempts to answer two questions:

- 1) What kinds of target language are people speaking (and hearing) in language classrooms?
- 2) What kinds of interactional patterns sustain or constrain this language production?

1.2.1 Procedural talk: A specific type of classroom talk

To address these questions, I have undertaken to observe the language that was actually being used, within specific classroom situations in one community over one period of time. I have focused on two particular contexts of talk specific to classroom learning: a context of talking about procedure and a context of justifying that procedure. Procedural talk in a classroom context is talk about what people should do.

Procedural talk includes directing, delegating, inviting, clarifying, repairing, and justifying learning tasks. It may provide cultural and historical contexts for how to perform classroom learning activities. Data from these classes include a considerable amount of talk that orients to, or focuses on, clarifications about what students and teachers are about to do and how they will do it. In addition to directions, the procedural talk involves students and teachers repairing their understanding of that procedure.

In most classes that I recorded, a subset of that procedural work involved people justifying why they were doing what they were doing. I refer to these interactions as *doing a justification*. Doing a justification matters in the context of revitalizing an endangered language because the potential costs of choosing inappropriate learning tasks are very high. Justifying why you are doing something a particular way can be seen as an immediate sub-aim to direct procedure for a particular learning task. Doing a justification often precedes actual procedural talk about setting up procedures. Consequently, I treat doing a justification as intrinsically connected to procedural talk. Doing a justification may be unique to this context. Thus, an innovative aspect of my dissertation is the examination of this type of classroom interaction.

I identified three sub-varieties of procedural talk across all the classes: (a) Type 1: setting up (and repairing) procedure, which is the focus of Chapter 4; (b) Type 2: doing a justification of the task and the procedure, which I discuss in Chapter 5; and (c) Type 3: talk about protocol in general, not addressed in this dissertation. The two first types of procedural talk shift attention from a focus on particular learning activities to a focus first on clarifying what is to be done, how it is to be done, and why. These types of procedural talk are part of many shared learning activities. These types of classroom language use also provided a sufficiently representative body of target language data for analysis.

The sources of my research data come from one program among the Halkomelem language communities. In order to protect the privacy of participants, I use pseudonyms for the classes and initials for the participants. I call the language Halkomelem as the cover term for a group of dialects that extend from Hope to the mouth of the Fraser River and up the east side of Vancouver Island. The purpose of the language program that was the site of this research, like many others, was to revitalize the language and accredit potential language teachers. The data was collected from the program during the period from September 2003 to May 2005.

Although many hours of classes were tape-recorded and transcribed, I chose a set of data that exemplified various types of interaction: teacher-fronted, elder-coached, and/or linguist-interpreted; communicative work between learners in pair interview tasks and a group jigsaw activity; and one-on-one mentoring between a fluent speaker and one learner. The data were drawn from nine classes: (a) three Language Review (LR) classes (developed through the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University (SFU)); (b) three Language Immersion (LI) classes (through a community-run program); (c) two Linguistics classes; and (d) a mentoring session. The LI classes included the current cohort of people who were learning the language through an intensive community-based program, which was termed immersion. The LR classes were set up to provide an opportunity for the previous graduates of the community-based immersion program to continue to use and review the language. The Linguistics classes were part of a course that is required for the Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency (CFNLP), offered through the SFU/Kamloops Program. Linguistics courses in this program are usually taught by a native speaker, or co-taught by a linguist and native speaker team. The mentoring course is also part of SFU's CFNLP. It is offered where a fluent native speaker is available to work face to face with one or at most two language

learners in a naturalistic context. The course is modelled on Hinton's (2001, 2002) master-apprentice model and is delivered in many communities in British Columbia and the Yukon. The classes in the data set are explained further in Section 3.2.

I assume that the way people interact in different kinds of activities affects the way they talk and the types of language that they produce. As a result, I have chosen not only to record language production, but to examine in some detail what people are doing interactionally as different kinds of language happen. I use a Conversation Analysis methodology to reveal this process. This approach is described in Section 2.3.1. Briefly, I assume that the way that we talk with each other, in turns within face-to-face conversation, both reflects and shapes the grammar of our language. Specifically, in this dissertation I focus on the turn-taking and repair that occur in face-to-face classroom interaction.

For many endangered languages, the main locus of language learning is a community-based or university-sponsored second language (L2) classroom, in contrast to natural acquisition or to immersion in a multifaceted community of speakers. I assume that the way we talk with each other in classrooms plays a formative role in the emergence of learners' interlanguages. Importantly, for a language in which the classroom is its main context of use, the way we talk in classrooms plays an essential role in the emergence of the language itself. A language can be seen as a shared long-term storage system of social practices, grammaticalized constructions, and a lexicon.⁵ Therefore, observing these classrooms can reveal the mechanisms by which a language comes to be shared and, in this context, re-established under critically threatened and high stakes conditions. An analysis of the interactional architecture of the talk in different learning contexts will illustrate how the participants talk their language into being. Rather than focusing on language loss or even 'revitalization', such an analysis may provide a data-driven examination of the process of construction and reconstruction in one endangered language.

It is important to note that the analysis and description of this program reflect only what was happening at that time. In the almost six years subsequent to when this data was collected, many things have changed. For example, many of the learners have made significant gains in their understanding and use of Halkomelem. The usual Linguistics instructor has substantially changed his approach from the format recorded

⁵ Some researchers describe this as 'socially distributed cognition' (Bell & Winn, 2000; Jonassen & Land, 2000; Schegloff, 1991).

in my data. I have changed my approach to teaching and continue to adjust it in reaction to how I observe and participate in interaction in Halkomelem. Consequently, my analyses do not present a picture of any individual's approach. Instead, this thesis illustrates how some of the interactional choices that we all make as teachers and learners enable and constrain us in talking Halkomelem.

1.2.2 Relevance of the research

This research provides some practical suggestions for communities interested in increasing the use of endangered Aboriginal languages. The data provides some insights into how communities can best organize the scarce resources of fluent elder speakers and non-fluent supporting instructors through an informed and strategic management of interactional options. The thesis also provides a detailed picture of the process of revitalizing one endangered language.

CHAPTER 2: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 Second language learning: A theoretical perspective

The perspective that I take in this dissertation views language as situated in social actions or uses (Austin, 1962; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001; Heath, 1983; Heritage, 1984; Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Searle, 1969), social organization (Malinowski, 1945/1961), and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The perspective rises out of the empirical tradition rather than the idealist tradition. It draws its working assumptions from the symbolic interactionism of Herbert Blumer (1969) and the linguistics of Halliday (1994) and Hymes (1974). The methodology of this perspective originates in the ethnomethodology and *alternate* sociology of Garfinkel (1967)⁶ and Grice (1975), and its offshoot, the conversation analysis of Sacks (1984, 1992) and Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). Social interaction is seen as interaction between actors, and not as interaction between psychological and/or social factors imputed to those actors (Blumer, 1969, p. 8). Within this perspective, meaning is an interpretive and localized process, constructed in the collaborative work of participants in face-to-face interaction in real time (Hopper, 1987; Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996; Turnbull, 2003).

The data in this dissertation are drawn, correspondingly, from transcriptions of “naturally occurring occasions of everyday interaction” in real time (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, p. 2), or what certain people do and say together in a certain situation. In Blumer’s terms, the research is grounded in a naturalistic examination of the empirical social world. Specifically, my research examines forms of interaction in a language-learning context.

The notion of *activity* links the development of meaning through interaction to a specific situation (Donato & McCormick, 1994; Duranti 1997; Jonassen, 2000; Leontyev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). Within a Vygotskian framework, activities situated in a sociocultural context are *mediated* by language and transform individual mental functioning (Wertsch, 1991, p. 91). Mental functioning evolves, not out of

⁶ Its relation to ‘conventional’ Parsonian sociology is described in Button (1991).

individual invention or perception, but from the mediating power of language or other tools and signs through some form of collaborative activity. Dunn and Lantolf (1998, p. 427) describe this process as the “historically situated activity of living”.

In language classrooms, the learning activity is the locus of interaction and is critically involved in the construction of the language, or structures of a grammar, used by participants to create their interaction (Schegloff et al., 1996, p. 21). In much post-Vygotskian inspired research, meaning-making (Kozulin, 2003; Mahn, 2003; Miller, 2003) is seen as emerging out of mediated and scaffolded activity.⁷ My research, however, focuses on how language itself emerges out of mediated and scaffolded activity. As Hall, Cheng and Carlson (2006, p. 234) argued, “particular forms of language knowledge” emerge from “the means by which language users’ and learners’ involvement in the various constellations of their practices is constituted.”

In the context of an endangered language, the role of the interaction of co-present participants is especially critical, not just to learning the language, but to re-creating a context in which the participants revitalize and re-create the language itself. Consequently, the state of the language critically depends on how people are interacting in it as they use the language to do things in language classrooms. This relationship is termed *reflexive* and refers to the ethnomethodological concept that social actions and talk both reflect cultural reality and create that reality. This process is open to observation. Researchers may observe what people are doing during *talk in interaction*, where all interactants are actively contributing to the organization and outcome of talk (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 1996; Turnbull & Carpendale, 1999).

The notion of activity is familiar in a language-learning situation. Language lessons are usually organized in a series of pedagogical actions, or a lesson plan, reflecting subaims of an overall learning objective. Such activities are both familiar to participants and determined and effected by participants. This notion of activities is congruent with an ethnomethodological notion of insider categories of analysis.⁸

⁷ Vygotsky wrote of words (language or other socially constructed tools) mediating the development of concepts (higher mental processes or thought). However, Wertsch (2000) discussed how Vygotsky’s notion of *thought* was a cover term for two distinct notions of meaning: (i) increasingly abstract referential relationships between signs and objects; and (ii) decontextualized *znachenie*, ‘meaning’ and personal *smysl* ‘sense’, reflecting two different intellectual traditions.

⁸ This evokes the earlier terms *etic* and *emic*, widely used in the social sciences, but which originate from Pike’s (1964) distinction between a phonetic (impressionistic, outsider’s) writing system and a phonemic (insider’s, contrastive) system for transcribing speech sounds.

Examples of insider categories in my research are the notions of revitalizing the language, the special status of the language, and the high stakes learning context. These concepts are not outsider's categories, but are created through the participants' talk as it is co-constructed, and meaning is jointly established. These concepts can be witnessed in the transcription of their talk because participants treat each utterance as a piece of evidence about any situation, to which they orient accordingly. Each next speaker's turn reflexively creates that situation through its interpretation of the previous speaker's turn. This sequence of turns creates mutual understanding of what is happening, an understanding which is consequently also available to observers.

Interactions unfold in real time but are also situated in historical time (Blumer, 1969; Jonassen, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). Human actions "necessarily arise out of a background of previous actions of participants" (Blumer, 1969, p. 20). The issue of historical situatedness is particularly poignant for a critically endangered language such as Halkomelem. The aim of the revitalization efforts for any endangered language is not just for individuals to learn a language, but also for them to revitalize it for the community and for future generations. The participants constantly *orient* to this challenge (i.e., explicitly discuss it as an issue in ongoing talk; see also section 2.3.1). This challenge introduces another participant to the context: the future speakers for whom the loss of the language would have a terrible cost. In order to adequately describe this reflexive and historically-situated process, my research adopts a model of learning that encompasses both individual learning and its interactive context through focusing on language use. I turn next to describing such a model.

2.2 An interactionist model: Co-constructing meaning

Language can be viewed as either a shared tool or a collective co-construction. In the classic view of language as a shared tool, language is hypothesized to be handed down from speaker to speaker, perfectly in the case of native speaker acquisition, or imperfectly in the case of endangered languages with broken intergenerational transmission.⁹ In the interactionist view of language as a collective co-construction, language is always in the process of being created and recreated. In adopting an interactionist approach, I see both language in general and an endangered language in particular as constantly becoming, with speakers using the resources of previous

⁹ I see the perfect transmission model of language as innatist rather than cognitivist, but do not pursue this debate further here.

speakers to jointly construct meaning. I adopt a perspective that sees speech as “temporal, emergent and disputed” (Hopper, 1987, p. 141), or *emergent* (Bybee & Hopper, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Langacker, 1991; Mellow, 2008). This interactionist perspective also reflects the distinction of Schegloff (and Garfinkel) between the Parsonian or Durkheimian concept of sharing knowledge through a common culture and the Conversation Analysis concept of sharing *procedures* for constructing *commonsense knowledge*, or in this context, the language itself (Schegloff, 1991, p. 151).

In this dissertation, I have assumed an interactionist framework and used the methodology of Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA) to document the types of language that are being used in different kinds of interactions. An interactionist framework eschews the notion of language acquisition (Krashen, 1981), a construct associated with individuals, in favour of the notion of language knowledge being constructed through participation in activity-sensitive interaction (Hall, Cheng, & Carlson, 2006; Lave & Wenger, 1991). The interactionist framework considers language use as it is manifested through interaction in specific learning situations. A number of European researchers also work within this stronger interactionist approach and have called for “a revision of the Vygotskian concept of social mediation” (Mondada & Doehler, 2004, p. 515). These researchers highlight the role of interaction in how participants actively and in an ongoing process construct their own “learning environments, tasks, identities, and contexts” (Pekarek Doehler, 2002, quoted in Mondada & Doehler, 2004, p. 515).

Techniques drawn from CA (Nofsinger, 1991; Psathas, 1995; Sacks, 1984; Sacks et al., 1974; Seedhouse, 2004; Turnbull, 2003) allow examination of how the co-participants accomplish learning tasks through talk, and, in the process, create the context in which talk operates. Researchers can follow how participants work to understand, provisionally and for all practical purposes, through the means of language that they are doing the same things in the same world. In other words, we can witness how participants co-construct their world.

The aim of the participants in my research is to learn a language through specific learning tasks. By undertaking these language learning actions, participants build a shared reality about what they are doing and how they are doing it. This shared reality is described as a state of *intersubjectivity* (see section 2.3.1.4). Some of this work by the learners is expressed through the target language. My aim in this research is to trace the development of that shared reality as it is displayed through its conversational

machinery. Further, because I examine the language output of this work, my focus is necessarily linguistic. That is, my research falls into a subcategory of CA work that is specifically interested in how linguistic structures or 'units' are revealed in the situated practices of conversation, as characterized by CA analysis (Ford & Thompson, 1996)¹⁰.

The choice to adopt the interactionist approach is strategic as well as theoretical. Two important issues can be investigated by examining how interactants display their mutual understanding in the details of their interactions. First, this methodology provides a practical and relevant indicator of the developmental level of the participants' language (i.e., from an individual cognitive perspective, their interlanguage, [Seedhouse, 2004, p. 240]). Second, this discovery procedure shows how they mutually achieve their language ability. As the interactants display their understanding in the target language, the details of this accomplishment document for an endangered language how its grammar is being co-constructed and reconstructed. A strong hypothesis would be that for an endangered language what you hear in classrooms is largely what now exists of it. An empirically based approach using CA provides a realistic and revealing opportunity to take stock of actual language production to inform ongoing efforts at language revitalization. In addition, the interactional details of how participants achieve intersubjectivity provide a window into the mechanics of language revitalization.

The interactionist perspective is complementary to the group of theories currently called usage-based linguistics. The usage-based approach assumes that frequency of exposure to specific constructions contributes substantially to first language acquisition (Allen & Crago, 1996; Bybee & Hopper, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Pye & Quiztan Poz, 1988; Swain & Lapkin, 2008; Tomasello, 2003). The usage-based approach also assumes that judgements about language knowledge cannot be separated from observations of language use (Hall, Cheng, & Carlson, 2006, p. 233).

Following Tomasello (2003, p. 100), I examine the learner data to identify emerging constructions (complex patterns of use such as Noun Phrase+Verb Phrase+Noun Phrase). The constructions in a highly polysynthetic language such as Halkomelem do not correspond very closely to the kinds of constructions that are used

¹⁰ As Ford and Thompson say, they take seriously Sacks et al's assumption (1974, p. 772) that language structures are designed for conversational use (Ford & Thompson, p. 136).

in English. However, usage-based linguistics is effective for understanding the learning of these diverse languages because it does not assume cognitive universals of linguistic structure. Instead, Tomasello (2003, p. 100) argues for general universals of learning that include a shared set of “many different cognitive, social-cognitive, information-processing, and learning skills.” Tomasello (2003, p. 321) argues that these processes include the “foundational skills... of intention-reading and pattern-finding”, as well as schematization and analogy, entrenchment and competition, and functionally based distributional analysis. These cognitive processes occur in conjunction with cultural learning as part of social, cultural and historical processes.

Grammatical structure is seen as “a spreading of systematicity from individual words, phrases and small sets” (Hopper, 1987, p. 142) through the process of grammaticalization (Mellow, 2008). My understanding of this position is that grammatical constructions become grammaticalized on two levels: a) historically for any cultural group, and b) ontogenetically for individuals. Sequences of words are used as “meaningful linguistic symbols” (Tomasello, 2003, p. 5) that become structural patterns or grammatical constructions, historically through patterns of use over time, and individually through patterns of human interactions in real time. Frequency of exposure to such constructions contributes substantially to learning in a usage-based approach. Memory of language constructions is distributed rather than local (Langacker, 1991, p. 527), weighted through many connections rather than innately parameterized. Overall, the approach in this dissertation has been informed by various schools of constructivism (Ellis, 2003, p. 63), including the parallel distributed processing models of Rumelhart and McClelland (1986), those of cognitive linguists such as Langacker (1991), and Tomasello’s (2003) child language acquisition research. These contemporary fields of research model language constructions as emergent in an ongoing process that is fluid, unstable, and stochastic. Mental representations are considered to be “provisional and temporary states of affairs that are sensitive and constantly adjusting themselves to usage “ (Bybee & Hopper, 2001, p. 2). I will not examine these insights further other than to claim that, if language generally is sensitive to and formed from usage, then an examination of the usage of an endangered language is particularly critical.

In Tomasello’s approach, the motivation for the emergence of grammatical structures comes from humans’ particular ability to read each other’s intentions¹¹, and to exploit that faculty to organize human activity. A fundamental human bias towards

¹¹ Seedhouse, 2004, p. 9 described this as achieving *reciprocity of perspectives*.

cooperation relates to this human capacity for reciprocity of perspectives. It has variously been expressed by Garfinkel's *breaching* experiments (Heritage, 1984), Grice's (1975) cooperative principles, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. Our ability (or desire) to achieve reciprocity of perspectives is a fundamental motivator in the development of language, as argued in current child acquisition research (Tomasello, 2003). For example, Tomasello (2003, p. 25) has shown that, around 1 year of age, human infants begin to engage with others in "all kinds of joint attentional activities" that "create a common intersubjective ground within which children and adults may understand one another's communicative attempts and their *current relevance* [italics added]". This issue of current relevance is a foundational concept of CA and other theories of language as situated in social action. Individuals may not be able to see inside each other's heads, but language provides a means of displaying, checking, and negotiating that interlocutors agree that they inhabit roughly the same world. This accomplishment, that participants can agree "for all practical purposes on what is going on in their interaction" (Turnbull, 2003, p. 161), is also termed intersubjectivity (see Section 2.3.1.4). Within a CA perspective, intersubjectivity is monitored on a turn-by-turn basis (Turnbull, 2003, p. 161). Cognitively, this process is enabled by the human capacity for intention reading (Tomasello, 2003, p. 19).

If the human capacity for sharing perspectives is critical to language development, then the context of talk is not just an added-on aspect that may tangentially affect language, but its source. Context of use is not just important, but essential.

In following this analysis, I take a CA perspective in narrowing the focus from historical time to real time, from cultural patterns to the primordial context of "co-present interaction" (Schegloff, 1996, p. 54), or conversation. In the metaphors of CA, turns at talk are the *hosts, natural habitat, home environment, or locus* of talk (Schegloff, 1996, pp. 54-55). Grammar is an adaptation to this fact, or its organizational result. Grammatical constructions and turns at talk are therefore mutually constraining. Grammatical constructions are shaped by the constraints of turns at talk. Turns at talk are constrained by grammatical constructions. The dynamic tension between these two is the locus for my research.

The unit of analysis in CA work is not a sentence or even a single utterance by an individual speaker, but a contribution by a speaker to an ongoing collaborative

construction of meaning. A contribution may evolve across several turns by various collaborators in its construction.

In summary, in using an interactionist approach, I find both the origins of language and the process of learning it in the human ability to recognize perspectives, and, ultimately and provisionally, to share perspectives. Language enables us to do this, and to collaboratively create and inhabit that reality. The other implication of this approach is that language constructions do the work of social actions and therefore emerge with meanings that are probabilistic, co-constructed, and in flux. In taking an interactionist approach, I also observe how interactants construct and confirm meanings through social interactions across turns of talk, situated in a particular time and place. I do not examine or assess how individuals *learn* as much as I observe how they *interact*. This is not to say that language and meaning do not also exist in individual minds. However, rather than inferring processes involved in the language learning of individuals, I have chosen to track the ways that meaning is co-constructed, as well as the language structures that are used, through the small choices of social interaction.

2.3 Analytic procedures of the research

In the following section, I briefly justify my choice of a CA framework for analysis and then summarize the CA terminology that relates to the data in the dissertation. I review Seedhouse's (2004) analysis of pedagogical foci as the specific subaims of classroom interaction, around which interaction is organized, and position his analysis as a basis for the dissertation. I summarize Seedhouse's findings for the interactional patterns of turn-taking and repair in the four different contexts of pedagogical focus that he identifies. Finally, I compare Seedhouse's findings with my findings and propose relevant analytic categories for the dissertation.

2.3.1 Using CA Methodology

A CA methodology was chosen as it offers a number of advantages for an analysis of language production in a highly endangered context. As Seedhouse (2004) argues, CA ensures construct validity. It is particularly adapted to showing the process of establishing intersubjectivity, and in this context, target language learning. It provides a systematic methodology for analysis and reveals an insider's view of the procedure. It also provides a detailed picture of the interactional organization of L2 classrooms. Seedhouse points out that although CA is neutral with respect to particular teaching

approaches, by focusing on *task-in-process* in classrooms versus *task-as-workplan*, it provides an empirical basis for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching approaches (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 264) as they actually unfold.

CA provides a framework to examine how shared meanings of language are accomplished through talk or talk-in-action. This approach is very different from one that views language meaning as part of a separate, a priori, decontextualized system. This process of constructing meaning is constituted in and through the interactional resources of conversation, namely, the practices for organizing turns, recognizing turn units, sequencing actions, and repairing troubles. The metaphor often used for this is mechanical (Mehan, 1979; Sacks, 1992; Seedhouse, 2004). These mechanisms, or the interactional *architecture* of talk, allow or facilitate the work of jointly achieving social actions (i.e., its products; Sacks, 1992, p. 169). In this context, these mechanisms have consequences for the regeneration of the language itself.

The choice of a CA methodology is motivated by a number of other considerations. First, my research generally follows Seedhouse (2004), which examines the organization of L2 classroom interaction using CA for its analyses. Seedhouse assumes a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction in any particular L2 classroom. In his view, the organization of interaction varies with the teaching focus¹² and the teaching focus is constructed through its interaction. Interactants display their understanding of what is happening by their response, in the way they pay attention to (i.e., *orient to*, see also section 2.1) what was said previously. This action and interaction reflect how people “talk institutions into being” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 200) and, in this particular institution, how people talk an L2 classroom context into being. Seedhouse’s analysis of the interactional architecture of a language classroom focuses specifically on turn-taking, sequence, and repair.

Secondly, as Seedhouse (2004, p. 34) notes, repair in classroom interaction plays a “heavier load than in other settings”. The goal in a situation designed to foster and guide structured language learning differs from ordinary conversation or even other institutional settings in this specific aspect. The way that repair happens is of critical interest to learners and teachers of any language but especially so for endangered languages where teacher fluency ranges from native-like to extremely limited.

¹² K. Toohey (personal communication, June 28, 2008) points out that much more than pedagogical focus happens in children’s classrooms! However, I limit my observations here to that.

Thirdly, because utterances are produced in turns at talk, an examination of turn-taking provides an empirically grounded analysis of target language production. Focusing on turn-taking avoids packaging language in words or segments, constructs which are not necessarily those of the speakers. Focusing on turn-taking also situates the analysis in everyday talk, the benchmark discourse type for language learners. In addition, turn-taking subsumes issues of sequence organization.

As first proposed by Sacks et al. (1974), the terminology for a CA model is described in terms of an economic metaphor. Turns at talk, like turns in other kinds of extended social activities, are seen as valued resources, subject to a distribution system with unique constraints. Participants use turns at talk (and other structures of conversation) as resources for social actions. These conversational resources are context-free because they are the necessary components of any system to allocate turns at talk. They are also context-specific because the details of their machinery are sensitive to the context of use. These interactional resources include: (a) turn-taking, (b) adjacency pairs, and (c) repair.

2.3.1.1 Turn taking

Talk in human interaction in every culture is organized in turns at talk. Fundamentally, the structure of any language must reflect the requirement for human interaction in real time, and is constructed, therefore, primordially within turns at talk (Schegloff, 1996; Turnbull, 2003, p. 18). A major contribution of CA is showing the way in which the turn-taking system provides the main structure for participants to make sense of interaction and of the co-construction of meaning across turns.

A turn at talk is meaningful because it sequentially orients to the preceding turn and projects the following turn. In other words, speakers produce turns at talk by responding to previous turns, regularly and systematically tailoring their current turn with previous and potential following turns. This process is termed the *recipient-designed* nature of talk (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 92) and is the way that talk is an *indexical* system. The concept of indexicality relates to how interactants display their attention to specific aspects of their context and how this attention invokes that context (i.e., *points to* the context) or “talks the context into being” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 7).

Because speakers display their ongoing understanding of previous turns by what they say next, this interactional nature of conversation provides a methodological procedure for both participants and analysts. The turn-by-turn analysis of talk rests

upon what is known in CA as the next turn proof procedure (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 728). By noticing the import of the next interactant's turn, the analyst can witness participants' interpretation of the previous turn as well as the way that the meaning of (in this case) the pedagogical focus is jointly constructed, or evolves, across a series of turns. Observation of how a speaker responds to a previous turn provides a procedure for proof on the speaker's own analysis. This next-turn-proof procedure is illustrated by Wittgenstein's observation (1953; quoted in Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004, p. 510) that (specifically) instructions are always indexical "in the sense that their execution always involves a range of possible interpretations."

Because each turn is dependent on the meaning of the previous turn and is interpreted by the next turn, people must listen to each other talk in real time. Sacks et al. (1974) described initially the timing of this system as a locally managed, indexical system. In contrast to other types of institutional talk, conversation does not have a pre-allocated system of turn-taking when one speaker finishes speaking. Either the current speaker selects another speaker, or some other speaker self-selects, or the current speaker continues. This *rule* applies recursively (Turnbull, 2003). The evidence from CA research is that most conversational talk is organized with very little overlap or temporal gap (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 27), even though speakers have not rehearsed and cannot know who will speak next or when. However, somehow speakers do anticipate when the previous speaker's turn at talk could be completed and then actively and appropriately seek the next turn in real time.

The anticipation of an end to a turn is achievable because turns are composed of projectable chunks or *unit-types*, called *Turn-Constructional Units*, hereafter, TCUs, (Sacks et al., 1972, p. 702). TCUs are social actions, not linguistic units, and may include a variety of structures, such as sentences, clauses, phrases, or lexical constructions, as well as language-specific coordinations of pragmatic and/or prosodic cues (Ford & Thompson, 1996). Both the timing of the turn taking and the content of each turn in conversation is open-ended rather than pre-allocated.

The actual switch in speakers happens at a *Turn-Relevance-Place* (hereafter TRP), as determined by the language-specific content of the TCU. The rhythm, timing, degree of overlap, selection of participants, and content of contributions constitute the structural characteristics of taking turns within talk-in-interaction. The work of interaction through talk is most easily recognizable through the ongoing negotiation of these aspects.

In my research, I have examined various types of interaction with different pedagogical foci in order to understand the ways that people manage to navigate these structural requirements. I attempted to determine the ways that conversation participants select speakers, change speakers, find turn relevance places to change turns, and package their turns in TCUs in different types of action sequences. These choices have linguistic consequences. The ways that actions are packaged frame the ways that language itself is reflexively constructed.

For example, classrooms typically foster an interactive structure termed ‘teacher-fronted’. Within this interactional type, teachers often tightly control turn sequences and largely pre-determine the content of the subsequent (learner’s) turn. The content of learners’ turns may be determined by the teacher to consist of orthographic letters, translated words, one word answers, ‘complete’ sentences, or any other kind of predetermined “precise string of linguistic forms” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 102). Although CA uses the term *pre-allocated* to describe the type of turn-taking used in contexts such as court cases or debates where interactants have a pre-ordained order of speaking, Seedhouse (2004, p. 110) argues that certain classroom interactions have degrees of pre-allocated turns and language content, reflected by “the pedagogical focus and the organization of the interaction”. Seedhouse (2004, p. 109) explains that a teacher may have “allocated the adjacency pairs which the learners should use in the interaction (questions and answers) and has allocated the precise linguistic forms to be used”. However, because of this ambiguity in usage, I will use the term *predetermined* for such interaction.

A familiar pattern of turn-taking in a classroom situation is the IRE or IRF pattern. In this pattern a teacher initiates a question (I), a learner responds (R), and the teacher follows up with an evaluative response (E) (or feedback (F)). This pattern contrasts with the turn-taking organization of most everyday conversation, which is locally-managed on a turn-by-turn basis by participants and does not regularly include evaluations. An IRE pattern is illustrated in data set 2.1. (Note that in all data sets the turns are numbered and the speakers identified by initial as T (teacher), S (student), SS (students) or myself as participant (SR).

(2.1) February 11, (Linguistics class): Léxwe(thet) means cover oneself

1. T Uh (Name), (cough) do you wanna start us off (.) with uh some relaxing vocabulary practice before our quiz? (.) *chiyolh?* (1) fire

2.3.1.2 Adjacency pairs

Adjacency pair sequences are a subset of side-by-side turns at talk. These sequences make a specific sort of turn preferentially relevant in the next turn. The members of the sequence are termed the first-pair part and the second-pair part. Adjacency pairs provide a normative structure for participants to orient to and are the conversational means for linking specific sets of social actions. Examples of adjacency pair sequences include a question and answer as well as an invitation and response. In these pairs, the initial turn is an action that makes relevant and implies a further particular kind of second pair response from a co-present participant. Producing a question in one turn makes the next adjacent utterance interpretable as an answer. Interlocutors expect the next utterance after a question to constitute an answer and will interpret it as such or require an accounting of the reason if the answer does not appear.

An additional example is the *bye-bye* adjacency pair sequence. In my experience, one of the first social interactions some babies manage linguistically is doing goodbyes. When parents or visitors say *bye-bye* to infants, they do not initially expect a similar response. At some point, babies do respond and the adult reaction is often delight and amazement and much repetition of the *bye-bye* adjacency pair sequence. The baby is then successfully navigating a social interaction. She (or he) displays her (or his) understanding of someone's initial turn at talk as a specific kind of talk that makes his (or her) next turn an appropriate second pair part to a goodbye (i.e., *bye-bye*). The timing of this second-pair part is another factor in establishing the successful adjacency pair. If the baby manages the attendant wave and second-pair part after the initial interlocutor has left, successful reiteration of the social act is curtailed. People recognize a child's successful interaction as a sign of the baby taking part in social life and learning her language.

With respect to this aspect of CA analysis, talk is understood as it unfolds in turns, and specific types of social actions are made relevant through specific types of adjacency pairs. The side-by-side placement of turns in talk provides the structure for their conditional relevance and for participants to make sense of each other's social actions. Adjacency pairs are thus a basic means of effecting social actions and of establishing intersubjectivity (Duranti, 1997; Sacks et al., 1974; Turnbull, 2003).

2.3.1.3 Repair

Repair has been described as “the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 34), as the “sociopsychological engine that enables learners to get comprehended input” (Markee, 2000, also cited in Seedhouse, 2004, p. 141), or how breakdowns in intersubjectivity are fixed (Turnbull, 2003). Doing repair involves interactional choices about what gets repaired, who initiates the repair, who makes the repair, and where in the sequence a *repairable* is repaired (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, also cited in Turnbull, 2003, p. 163). The sequence of who does what when is termed its *repair trajectory* (Seedhouse, 2004) or *repair sequence* (Turnbull, 2003). Turnbull (2003, p. 163) explains that this sequence involves self (S) and other (O) in one of “four possible combinations of who initiates and who performs the repair: S-I S-R, S-I O-R, O-I S-R, and O-I O-R.”

One type of repair (other-initiated self-repair) is illustrated in the following excerpt (data set 2.2) from a Linguistics class.

(2.2) February 11, (Linguistics class): It could only have meant door:

1. T *xalh*
2. S door or road
3. T °door or road. ↑I was talking to (Name) toda:y >this is< for her
ro:ad (.) road
4. ? mhm
5. CD ((bling))=
6. T =but *yam-* in the sto:ry u::h (Name) used it for uh road. °Could
only have meant road there
7. S (xx)
8. T I meant (xx) it could only have meant doo:r, °she used it for door

In this class, the instructor is asking for translations for a word. The instructor in line 6 is establishing that there are two English translations possible for the Halkomelem word *xalh*: ‘road’ and ‘door’. The instructor establishes these translations by means of a

present elder, who is mentioned in line 3, and the voice of another elder available on CD ROM, who is mentioned in line 6. One trouble occurs in line 6 when the instructor gives the incorrect translation ('road') for the second instance, even after starting the utterance with the contrastive *but*. This is an opportunity for the speaker to self-repair. However, because the speaker passed this opportunity by, his whispered (or *sotto voce*) *could only have meant road there* only compounds the repairable moment. A listener then inaudibly produces an utterance, which is treated as an other-initiated repair. In response, the speaker then does a repair of the repeated repairable: *I meant (xx) it could only have meant doo:r, °she used it for door*.

A further observation from this context is that where everyone is learning the language, everyone other than the elders is also subject to assessment. As Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004, p. 510) explain, "the relevance of categories, such as expert or learner, can be redefined and renegotiated in the contingent course of action." This dissertation investigates and exemplifies how repairs contribute to this negotiation.

Even though the instructor is doing most of the talking in extract (2.2), his explication involving the repairable is actually already shared knowledge. The correct translation had already been offered in line 2 of the first adjacency pair of a question-answer sequence. Given the already shared status of the information being elaborated in lines 3-8, this excerpt may arguably also be classified as doing a justification of the particular translation offered. Specifically, *xalh* means 'door' or 'road' because these two native speakers use it those ways. The co-constructed nature of the contribution in line 2 is extended to involve the co-present elder, in relation to a conversation with her *today* in line 3, and the voice of another elder on the CD in line 6.

Repairs are especially important in a classroom where an endangered language is being learned. Not only does repair tend to bear a greater load in the L2 classroom than in other institutional settings (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 141), but in endangered language classes, it carries a double load. First, the repair indicates consensus that interlocuters have arrived at a shared understanding with these words and structures. Second, the repair shows the learners that these are the available and appropriate words and structures to make meaning with. If repair is the engine that establishes *comprehensible* input to learners, doing a justification of the repair is the engine that establishes *appropriate* input. This coordinated process of repair provides the mechanism for establishing intersubjectivity through talk.

2.3.1.4 Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity, or the achievement of reciprocity of perspective, is the state of being in consensus that interlocuters mean (roughly) the same things with language. Intersubjectivity is also a state in which interlocuters inhabit the same apparent reality or do so for current practical purposes. Intersubjectivity is achieved through the co-construction of meaning. Language enables meaning to be not *subjective* but *intersubjective*. Meaning is co-constructed when work on reaching agreement is effected over several turns by co-participants. This term has a somewhat broader scope than just *negotiation of meaning*, which implies a collaborative “attempt to remedy mis- or non-understanding” (Ellis, 1994, p. 267).¹³ Turnbull (2003, p. 29) described intersubjectivity as the carrying out of actions by participants to achieve understanding through a process of interpretation, as it is “manifestly displayed in their talk.” Repair is a main way for monitoring and re-establishing intersubjectivity, or consensus, that participants in talk have, at least temporarily, achieved that shared understanding, or more exactly, displayed that shared understanding.

In data set (2.3), I asked a student to report about her interview of another student. This data set illustrates the process of constructing intersubjectivity over several turns. The interviewer (S2) assists this process by scaffolding the interviewee’s (S1’s) responses with her.

(2.3) November 10, (Halkomelem maintenance): Green tea this morning

1. SR (Name), do you want to tell us about (Name) are you up for it
2. S1 I uh I only got as far as the (tea)
3. SR that’s okay, anything (.) give it a (2)
4. E hhh (15)
5. S2 okay yeah here it is
6. S1 °(sel) qoqet? (I) drank

¹³ Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004, p. 504) also use the term *negotiated* in a different sense than “an expert-novice relationship (or) scaffolded sequences of negotiation”; instead, they use it to mean interactions involving “cognitive practices, forms of attention, and conjoined orientations that are ...socially mediated and collectively monitored”.

7. S2 °yeah
8. S1 ↑ (sel) qoqet (.) te (1) ey ti (I) drank good tea
9. S2 ° tl'o latelh this morning
10. S1 (klo latheth) (this morning)
11. S2 latelh morning
12. S1 (lateth) (morning)
13. S2 ah you can say
14. S1 yeah
15. S2 tsqw[ay green
16. S1 [(skway) (green)
17. S2 tskway ti
18. S1 (skway) ti green tea (green) tea
19. E a::h a::w ah ((lengthy laughter))
20. All ((LAUGHTER))
21. SR kw'elh tu e:y [okay great!
22. All [((LAUGHTER))
23. S3 I remember what I did

The more adept student, S2, announces an upcoming telling about the morning events in line 5, *okay, here it is*. This offer is followed in line 6 by a whispered trial beginning (or pre-telling) by S1, ° (sel) qoqet? (the target form is *tsel qoqet*, 'I drank something'). This utterance is treated by S2 as a confirmation request, which she confirms in line 7 with °*yeah*. S1 repeats (sel) qoqet at normal volume in line 8, producing this turn as a contribution to the telling. S1 also extends the telling to what she drank: *te (1) ey ti*, 'good tea'. S2 continues her coaching in line 9 with ° *tl'o latelh*, 'this morning'. In

lines 10 and 12, S1 produces a pair of increasingly target-like attempts of the target form: *tl'o latelh*, 'this morning'. S2 offers a further modelled utterance in line 15, further scaffolding the contribution to a telling about drinking *tskway ti*, 'green tea'. The subsequent utterances move through another repair sequence in lines 17 and 18. The form in line 18 is accepted by the co-present elder in line 19 with a series of approving expressions that end in extended laughter. This laughter is similarly echoed and cycled through a series of voices, picked up with louder laughter from everyone in line 20, formulaic praise by me in Halkomelem, *kw'elh tu ey!* in line 21, and group laughter again in line 22.

This display of affiliation through the cycling of repeated phrases and laughter across turns is treated by the participants as marking the achievement of a specific type of intersubjectivity (i.e., agreement about the appropriate form of the language for the moment at hand). Intersubjectivity is demonstrated through the mechanism of phrasal repetition. The end point of intersubjectivity is indicated by the fact that the next utterance (in line 23) *I remember what I did* is off-topic and starts another contribution about another student's telling. The provisional nature of intersubjectivity in this context is also shown by the fact that the input from S1 student is not quite target-like, but has been scaffolded to become closer to target like through this operation.¹⁴ The student's utterance was good enough for practical purposes. When the elder laughs, the process of determining how to say this utterance in Halkomelem has reached the end of its interactional sequence.

A CA analysis of interaction allows the researcher to examine the sequence of turns that led the participants to achieve intersubjectivity. This is the main legacy of ethnomethodology as practised in CA: that interactants can be seen to interact, and that the interpretation of this interaction is revealed in its details as participants are seen to co-construct shared meaning overtly, cooperatively, and provisionally.

Halkomelem has a word for this work, which the elders have provided for a language-learning place: *lets'emotew'txw*. The word can be translated as 'a place for (reaching) one mind together'. The notion of intersubjectivity is therefore explicit in this context of learning Halkomelem. The Halkomelem word *lets'emotew'txw* suggests a shared conceptualization between the research model that I have adopted and the overall goal of the community.

¹⁴ An implication is that intersubjectivity is always provisional.

2.4 Seedhouse's model

Because my analysis is built upon an analysis of the properties of the organization of language classroom interaction presented by Seedhouse (2004), I first summarize that work in some detail in this section. I describe how Seedhouse (2004, p. 200) framed classroom language as a specialized form of institutional discourse with specialized goals and forms of interaction that “talk those goals into being.” I describe how he situates this analysis in contrast to some aspects of the communicative approach. Finally, I summarize how Seedhouse derives the unique aspects of interaction in a language classroom from its overall goal, specifically to teach a target language. In the following section I distance my study from his critique of Communicative Language Teaching and outline my own findings.

2.4.1 Institutional discourse

Language allows people to organize themselves to accomplish shared goals and to articulate and formulate those goals. In ordinary (non-institutionalized or non-educationally framed) talk, the goals of talk may evolve out of the interaction itself. In contrast, second language classrooms share with other kinds of institutional discourse some over-riding, specific, and predetermined goal or goals (Levinson, 1992; Seedhouse, 2004). In the case of L2 classrooms, one overall goal is to learn a target language.

Seedhouse (2004, p. 183) describes this core goal of a classroom language-learning situation as “the teacher will teach the learners the L2.” Certain characteristic interactional properties are implied because L2 classes are about language and what people are doing in them is teaching (or learning) a language. Through examining how the participants use the interactional resources available in various types of activities, it is possible to trace how participants reach their overall goal and to see how these resources shape the resulting goal.

Seedhouse argues that the overall goal of language in a language classroom situation implies three unique aspects for language use for this context. First, language has a unique role in language classrooms as both the “vehicle and object of instruction” (Long, 1983, p. 9). Analyses of other kinds of conversation or even other forms of institutional discourse do not focus on the production of language in the same way in relation to the social goals of the participants. In non-classroom contexts, language is produced incidentally to the process of social interaction towards other goals. In a second language classroom context, however, the production of some language is the

goal as well as the means for achieving the goal¹⁵. Whatever the type of interaction or learning situation may be in the classroom, the role of the target language itself is always the main focus of interest and concern to the participants. Language is ostensibly what the classroom is all about.

A second characteristic of learning and teaching a second language is that linguistic forms produced in this context are all potentially subject to evaluation by the participants (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 184). The role of the teacher is typically privileged in linguistic and other knowledge about the target language. A power differential between the teacher and learners entails some characteristic interactional constraints, which are validated by the overall aim of the enterprise.

Seedhouse's third and main thesis was that interaction reflects the overall aim of any enterprise. In the case of an L2 classroom, the aim is to teach a target language. Different institutional aims have typical and different varieties of interactional practices (i.e., they are different from baseline, everyday conversation and from other forms of institutional discourse; Drew & Heritage, 1992). Similarly, Seedhouse proposed that the sub-aims of any enterprise are reflected in the unique characteristics of the particular interaction that talks them into being.

Seedhouse uses Drew and Heritage's (1992, p. 205) example of courtroom talk as an example of an institutional variety of discourse with certain common features. Courtroom talk has historically developed interactional procedures and requirements that reflect sub-aims (e.g., doing a cross-examination) of the overall aim.

Similarly, in an L2 classroom situation, the sub-aims of teaching the target language are the different pedagogical foci towards which learning and teaching activities are oriented. An example of one sub-aim of the overall enterprise is to direct the procedure for a particular learning activity. Another sub-aim may be to justify this procedure as an appropriate means of achieving a larger aim. The details of interaction are organized to achieve these sub-aims and are reflected in different subvarieties of interactional practices (e.g., in the way in which participants take turns, sequence their contributions, and repair mutual understanding). These details of interaction are accomplished by different language structures.

¹⁵ As Nunan (1996, p. 60) says, for second language teachers...the medium is the message.

A particular pedagogical focus is realized through the particular characteristics of the interactional organization that are used by participants to construct that focus. Turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair are the resources used by participants to construct this focus. Seedhouse terms this the reflexive relationship between the interactional organization and the pedagogical focus.

In summary, Seedhouse's model describes three interactional properties specific to L2 classroom interaction. First, language is both the vehicle and object of instruction.¹⁶ Second, the language that is produced is subject to evaluation by the teacher. The teacher may subsequently make an evaluation move, followed by repair. Third, there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the interaction (i.e., as the pedagogical focus varies, so does the organization of the interaction). Interactants display this evolving focus through the details of their interaction.

Despite varied interactional practices, implementation of the overall institutional goal necessitates a basic sequence of L2 classroom interaction in Seedhouse's model. First, a pedagogical focus is introduced. Second, two speakers speak in the L2 in orientation to this pedagogical focus. Third, their analysis of and orientation to this focus is displayed in the turns that they take. This sequence is how the L2 classroom institution, as well as the identities¹⁷ of participants, are *talked into being* by the interactants. Turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair constitute the interactional resources available to the participants to talk the L2 classroom context into being.

Seedhouse provides a rationale for examining the turn-by-turn means by which interactants talk into being the context of each pedagogical focus. The rationale is that such a methodology can distinguish between (a) text-internal accounts (i.e., what teachers explicitly say they are going to do); (b) text-external/ethnographic accounts (e.g., lesson plans or after the fact accounts of the purpose of the interaction); and (c) the empirically recorded turn-by-turn interaction. In other words, this procedure for analysis distinguishes the intended pedagogical focus (task-as-work-plan) from the actual pedagogical focus (task-in-process), (Breen, 1989).

¹⁶ Because much language instruction takes place in the learners' L1 in this data, presumably this means that *when* the target language is spoken, it is both vehicle and object of instruction.

¹⁷ Seedhouse (2004, p. 200) clarifies that CA does not claim *identity* is necessarily relevant, but that an observation of turn-by-turn talk will reveal *whether* participants orient to their institutional identities.

2.4.2 Seedhouse challenges the communicative approach

Seedhouse contrasts his position with the communicative approach to language teaching, which was developed through the 1980s (Canale & Swain, 1980; Johnson, 1982; Savignon, 1983; Long & Porter, 1985; Long & Sato, 1983; Nunan, 1987, 1988; Prabhu, 1987; Skehan, 1998). Richards and Rogers (2001, pp. 151-158) termed this a paradigm shift that emerged in reaction to philosophical and theoretical shifts and to the limitations found from Situational Language Teaching in Britain and Audiolingualism in North America. This shift was influenced by work in the Council of Europe, the writings of Wilkins, Widdowson, Candlin, Brumfitt and Johnson as well as the work within linguistics of Halliday, Hymes, Firth, and Malinowski. The educational ideas of John Dewey also informed this approach¹⁸.

Seedhouse (2004, p. 67) argues that in the late 1980s “a tradition developed which saw much traditional L2 classroom communication as undesirable”. This approach privileges certain types of discourse as *natural* or *authentic* over others, or specifically, privileges everyday (ordinary, non-institutional) language as “genuine” or “natural” communication (quotation marks in Seedhouse 2004).

Terms like *authentic* or *genuine* are neither CA terms nor linguistic terms. Typically, the notion of authenticity in communicative language teaching includes two concepts. First, language materials are drawn from some exemplar of real-world discourse, such as a newspaper, advertising flyer, bus schedule, or conversation, which could obviously also include a classroom context (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 132-133). Second, a task should relate to students’ personal lives and own needs and purposes (Skehan, 1998, p. 183). These two concepts¹⁹ reflect a stance within communicative language teaching in which tasks that arise out of learners’ attempts to build meaningful interactions in a target language are thought to be preferred by learners. In addition, these tasks are thought to motivate language learning on more cognitive and emotive levels than will pattern learning, drills, or other decontextualized activities.

As Seedhouse argues, the desired type of classroom interaction recommended by communicative proponents would replicate non-institutional language. This desired interaction is “characterized by uneven distribution of information, the negotiation of meaning (through, for example, clarification requests and confirmation checks), topic

¹⁸ This tradition also informs this research, as described in Section 2.1.

¹⁹ Dicker et al. (2009, p. 157) use the term *authentic* in terms of being produced originally and specifically in Inuitutit, and not translated.

nomination by more than one speaker, and the right of interlocutors to decide whether to contribute to an interaction or not” (Nunan, 1987, p. 137, also cited in Seedhouse, 2004, p. 68). For classrooms, this type of interaction suggests open trajectories of turns and repair, as well as a focus on meaning rather than on form.

These are familiar mantra to modern language teachers. The communicative approach aims to provide authentic learning materials with accompanying tasks that relate to real-world issues and, most critically, to issues in learners’ own lives. The term *negotiation of meaning* also has had a long research tradition within the communicative approach in its exploration of the influence of classroom interaction (Ellis, 1994; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Pica 1994; Varonis & Gass, 1985²⁰).

One summary of the essential characteristics of communicative tasks in language learning is provided by Skehan (1998, p. 95), in which he contrasted the traditional PPP approach (i.e., Present, Practice and Produce) with an authentic, task-based syllabus. Skehan claims that that task-based approach has the following characteristics:

- meaning is primary,
- there is some communication problem to solve,
- there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities,
- task completion has some priority; and
- the assessment of the task is in terms of its outcome.

However, Seedhouse (2004) criticizes what he terms the communicative approach to L2 classroom interaction as being a-theoretical and problematic in several ways²¹. He argues that the communicative approach equates genuine communication with everyday conversation and ignores the genuine and rational goals of institutional discourse. The goals and structures of interaction for institutional purposes are different from, and irrelevant to, those of ordinary conversation. Seedhouse (2004, p. 77) argues

²⁰ Gass and Varonis developed a discourse model for negotiation of meaning, or ‘routine for non-understanding,’ that featured several functional phases: a trigger, an indicator, a response, and an optional reaction. The whole set was termed a conversational “pushdown”.

²¹ Other than to raise this issue of how Seedhouse criticizes the Communicative Language Teaching, I do not discuss this approach any more extensively here, assuming reader familiarity with the currently most widely accepted approach to language teaching (Richards & Rogers, 2001, p. 151).

that there is no basis for “evaluating one variety of discourse as better, more genuine or more natural than another.”²²

Seedhouse argues further that aspects of traditional classroom interaction (e.g., the IRE/IRF²³ cycle) are common in other language acquisition contexts. For example, the use of display instead of referential questions is common in other forms of everyday talk that may focus on language learning, such as mother-child discourse. He finds this pattern in fact omnipresent in much of the published transcripts of conversation in home and school environments, as well as citing its use in a learning context documented in a 4th century Buddhist scripture (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 75)²⁴. He argues this pattern can also be dynamic, fluid and offer learners ‘interactional space’ (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 72).

2.4.3 Seedhouse’s findings

In this section, I summarize Seedhouse’s findings regarding turn-taking and sequence and his findings regarding the organization of repair in the contexts of four different pedagogical foci: (a) a focus on form-and-accuracy, (b) a focus on meaning-and-fluency, (c) a focus on task, and (d) procedural focus.

For each pedagogical focus, Seedhouse analyzed turn-taking in terms of type of sequencing, organization of turns, control over turn-taking, and topic control (by whom), as well as types of language produced. He analyzed repair in terms of typical participants, repair trajectories, types of repair, and focus of repair (i.e., what is a repairable, see Seedhouse, 2004, p. 142), as well as types of language produced.

2.4.3.1 Form and accuracy

In his analysis of turn-taking and sequence in second language classrooms in a form-and-accuracy context,²⁵ Seedhouse (2004) found tight control of turn-taking by the teacher within an interactional sequence primarily of a typical adjacency pair structure; specifically of teacher prompt and subsequent learner production. This teacher-

²² Seedhouse is distinguishing pedagogical concepts such as *genuine* or *natural* from theoretical interaction research (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 77-78), rather than criticizing communicative language approach as not pedagogically sound.

²³ Seedhouse quotes numerous researchers who claim such interactional patterns as display questions and the IRE/IRF cycle ‘rarely occur in genuine interaction’ (2004, pp. 68 & 71-75).

²⁵ The interactional structure was exemplified through three activities: (a) the whole class repeating the teacher’s sentence while pointing to a picture of an object; (b) a ‘slot and filler’ exercise to insert a vocabulary item; and (c) individual practice of a construction (e.g., *yes I have in answer to do you have a(n) X?*) as preparation for pair practice of the same construction.

controlled discourse contrasts, of course, with a more conversational model of locally-managed turn-taking in which there is no control of speaker turns, turn content, or turn size (Sacks et al., 1974) and more common self-initiated self-repair. In contrast to conversation, a repair trajectory specific to the L2 classroom was teacher-initiated peer-repair. Furthermore, the language produced in the L2 classroom was precise strings of language, with no opportunity for learners to initiate or develop their own topics or to express their own attitudes, feelings, or personal meanings. The linguistic forms produced did not carry the topic forward or present new information, in contrast with ordinary conversation (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 104).

2.4.3.2 Meaning and fluency

In an analysis of turn-taking and sequence in a meaning-and-fluency context, Seedhouse (2004, p. 117) found that students were provided with sufficient *interactional space* to nominate and develop topics and sub-topics. The presence of change of state tokens, such as *oh*, and the use of clarification requests indicated that the teacher was not anticipating the direction of student response. The interaction was locally-managed on a turn-by-turn basis.

The management of repair in the L2 classroom was much closer to conversational repair. Interactants used clarification requests to focus on establishing mutual understanding and to negotiate meaning. Error correction only arose when trouble impeded understanding.

2.4.3.3 Task oriented

In his analysis of a task-oriented context, Seedhouse (2004, p. 153) notes that participants oriented to the successful completion of a task rather than to specific language forms, personal meaning, or fluency. Learner turns were generally minimal and indexical (or context-bound): short, highly elliptical, of simple constructions, and sometimes off-topic (Seedhouse 2004, p. 125). In a similar study, Duff (1986, p. 167) also found “short syntactically simple constructions” that were “topic comment constructions without syntacticized verbal elements”.

Repair focused on a variety of linguistic, procedural, or cognitive issues (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 156), depending on the factor that impeded task-completion. Repair was mostly conducted by students. One common pattern was self-initiated other-repair. Seedhouse also found minimal linguistic output during a focus on task, and

consequently argued against using only a task-based-learning approach to the exclusion of other approaches.

2.4.3.4 Procedural context

Seedhouse (2004, p. 133) characterized the procedural context as obligatory in a second language learning context. He found no turn-taking at all, with procedural talk usually delivered as teacher monologues and with learner turns either withheld or with small variation in learner response type. Procedural talk was delivered either in the L1, L2, or both, depending mostly on the age and proficiency of the learners.

Seedhouse notes a different preference structure for repair in procedural talk compared to the usual avoidance of explicit negative evaluation that he found in other pedagogical contexts. He found that when a misunderstanding about lesson procedure arose, teachers “very commonly use bald ‘no’s²⁶ in conjunction with other-initiated other-repair” (2004, p. 173).

In summary, Seedhouse (2004, p. 102) describes the particular contexts afforded within any second language learning situation as four broad types with corresponding pedagogical foci: (a) form and accuracy context, (b) meaning and fluency context, (c) task-oriented contexts, and (d) procedural context. Seedhouse’s (2004) main thesis is that through their interactions participants *talk into being* the four contexts of the specific goal-produced discourse of L2 classrooms (i.e., to learn a target language, see Section 2.4.1). In other words, the context of any language-learning event is revealed through the participants’ interpretations of it. For researchers, this requires that the labels for the actions and contexts for action must be derived from the data, rather than being theoretically presupposed. Accordingly, the terminology in my analyses is based upon the actions of the participants as they evolved in the data. In the next section I categorize these categories.

2.5 Analytic categories from the data: Seedhouse adapted

In the Halkomelem classrooms, I found somewhat different categories than those in the model presented by Seedhouse (2004). The overall goal in the Halkomelem classrooms was not just to learn the target language but also to revitalize the language.

²⁶ ‘Bald-on-record’ negative assessments (plain unmitigated *no-s*) would be considered potentially more face-threatening in terms of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, from which the term originates.

This goal is seen in extract 2.4 where a learner/student explicitly states her goal of passing on the language to future generations.

(2.4) September 26, 2003, (LI): Fluent speakers

1. S an it was very ser- it was my daughter's (.) that got me going an I
 just wanted to keep go:ing cuz I wanted them to keep the
 language tha- (.h) this is awesome cuz they'll be (.) like fluent
 speakers (.h)

Other subgoals in this context may include improving literacy skills, meeting ceremonial community needs, marking shared affiliation with others, displaying commitment to the language and culture, and/or sharing personal experiences.

In the Halkomelem classrooms, it is not as clear that the overall aim of the classroom context is for the teacher to teach the language as it is for the learners to somehow learn the target language. In contrast to Seedhouse's (2004, p. 183) assumption that teacher evaluation follows rationally from the overall goal, in this context the teacher may not always be in a position to offer an evaluation of the learner production.

Furthermore, I find no necessary theoretical conflict between a broadly communicative approach and an interactionist approach (cf. section 2.4.2). Although many kinds of interaction are equally authentic in an appropriate context, not all kinds of interaction are equally valued. Especially in an endangered language context, conversation *is* the very benchmark that people do value and aspire to gain proficiency in. Many learners verbalize their fear that without fluent speaker proficiency, their language itself will not continue to live. Communicative tasks are valued exactly because their successful performance replicates most closely the structures and characteristics of everyday conversation. Whether communicative tasks are most effective in fostering the level of proficiency that would enable everyday conversation is another question. However, although other kinds of (institutional) interaction may be employed to facilitate them, learners' ultimate goals for proficiency are certain types of interaction, like everyday conversation, that have open-ended sequence organization, as well as uneven distribution of information with locally-managed control of turn-taking and repair.

The four contexts for classroom interaction proposed by Seedhouse provided a starting place for examining the Halkomelem classrooms. However, after having

produced and familiarized myself with a written transcription of all the hours of taped classroom interaction in my data, I found that the data were effectively classified by the following types of pedagogical foci: (a) procedural focus (how to do things), (b) doing a justification (why things are being done the way they are), (c) protocol focus (how things should be done appropriately), (d) meta-linguistic focus (talking about the language), and (e) various task-related foci (various teaching or learning activities). Each pedagogical focus is realized through certain characteristics of turn-taking, repair options, and language content.

The first type of pedagogical focus is procedural. Many activities were prefaced by or interspersed with considerable time in explaining, negotiating, and/or clarifying how learning activities would be done. Other learning activities had minimal focus on how to do what people were doing.

A second pedagogical focus in my data was on doing a justification of the activity, its procedure, or the commitment by the learners to the language learning enterprise itself. During the justification, the teacher and/or learners may explain a dangerous or unsatisfactory situation where the proposed activity was not performed. This focus provides a powerful action sequence in the work towards achieving learning choices. Doing a justification is frequently couched in what Duranti (1997, p. 293, following Bakhtin) called *epic* words: “when the language that is being used is presented as the words of the ancestors, to challenge the content of someone’s speech means to challenge the foundations of the social order”. Doing a justification is evident in line 7 of extract 2.5, where a justification of current pedagogical choices is attributed to a higher authority.

(2.5) September 26, 2003, (LI): “The elders said”.

1. S2 so otherwise you (just) get (too many things),
2. T yeah
3. S mhm
4. S2 (too much) going o:n, and then
5. T mhm everybody=
5. S mhm

7. T =the elders said (.5) whe:n I went back and asked them, this is what they're trying to do:. we- we- done these books and the students are frustrated. they're really frustrated because they- they are- they're not speaking.(1) and she said (1) it- there's so much things going on. now. that get- she said- where it was long time ago we [didn't have] all the things we have today
8. S [mhm]

The elders' reported assessment is vital to co-constructing an assessment of immediately previous practices, an agreement that these practices were not producing speakers, and an analysis of why the practices were not successful. In such an action sequence, absent authorities can be very much present participants, invoked to constrain or justify a current procedural course of action. As noted by Foucault (1972, also cited in Clarke, 2005, p. 160), the choice of certain voices to do the justification implies that "a given discourse empowers certain agents to speak...while also disempowering others from doing so."²⁷

A third context of classroom interaction is a focus on protocol. The input, experience, and wisdom of an elder all guide much of the interaction in the classroom. This guidance extends beyond the mechanics of ordering actions, choosing language output, or specifying task details, and includes issues of cultural appropriateness and ethical human conduct. This focus on protocol was usually carried out in English. Because it may involve culturally sensitive information, this type of classroom interaction is considered beyond the scope of this research and not pursued further here.

A fourth context of interaction in these data has a meta-linguistic focus in sequences where participants talk about the language, as illustrated in extract 2.6.

(2.6) February 11, 2003, (Linguistics): Talking about the language

- T for those of you who took the 431 or the earlier courses this this will be familiar. the rest of you just (.) you know (.) sort of watch..h ah what *kw'ets'elxw* is to see: óxw is us and then *uxw*

²⁷ Kroskrity (2009, p. 74) raises the issue of whether a view of language as 'sacred', and of the elders' role as maintaining language 'purity', may actually place endangered languages "more at risk by reducing the number of environments...in which and by whom they can be appropriately used".

drops before *oxw* (1) and that gives you ((writes on blackboard)) *kw'etseloxw*. now that's the same thing happens here with ah ah *maytoxwes* but it's a little bit simpler. *mayt* is the help and *oxw* is the us and there's no there's no *exw* to drop so you just get *maytoxw*. so see us and help us. another thing: another core rule of halkomelem you probably see it like fifty times in this story (1) ↓ maybe twenty times ↑ when he she or it acts on any receiver you have to add an *es*. and so what's happening here is with *kw'etseloxw oxw* is a receiver, an object (.) and this he she or it or a noun here the somebody literally is acting on us, so you have to put an *es*.

In data set 2.6, an instructor takes an extended turn to talk *about* the language, both inviting learners to pay attention and participate (if they have the requisite shared background), or else just to *sort of watch*, that is, to forgo being a participant in the exchange.

The fifth context of classroom interaction involves task-related foci. These foci include and extend the assumed second language acquisition categories of *focus on fluency and meaning* (Savignon, 1972, also cited in Lightbown & Spada, 1993, pp. 81-82) and *focus on form and accuracy* (Lightbown & Spada, 1993, p. 83). Focus on fluency in L2 production does not necessarily entail understanding, that is, constructing meaning. For example, I may learn to perform a song in Czech fluently, without necessarily understanding any Czech at all. A focus on form and accuracy, or meta-linguistic focus, may include a range of foci that vary from a focus on the mechanics of literacy (i.e., spelling) without any grasp of meaning, to a focus on morphological structure, which enables a very fine-grained grasp of meaning. Consequently, I have used the term *task-related focus* in a more theoretically neutral and data-driven way, that is, for when participants talk in some language learning activity. Specific pedagogical activities within this focus include doing a choral reading, preparing a speech, doing a jigsaw task, doing group work, and doing an interview.

Protocol constraints and the limited scope of this project preclude investigating all these pedagogical foci. Consequently, the thesis considers only two pedagogical foci: procedural focus and doing a justification. These were chosen because a great deal of talk in almost all learning activities in the data focused on procedure, reflecting an ongoing need to set up what people were about to do together in a range of different

types of classes and activities. A relatively salient characteristic of this context was the need to justify why procedural things were to be done the way they were. Procedural focus and doing a justification were also chosen because interactions within these foci exhibited a great deal of variety in their target language complexity (as outlined in Section 1.2.1). They also provided a sufficiently representative body of target language data for analysis. Choosing these two related procedural contexts focuses this dissertation on a kind of work which tends to be part of every shared learning activity: clarifying what is to be done, how it is to be done, and why.

2.6 Summary

I take the position that language and society simultaneously and reciprocally construct each other through interaction. Building on Seedhouse's model that interaction is in a reflexive or reflective relationship with the pedagogical focus in a classroom situation, I see both language and pedagogical focus fostered and constrained through types of interaction. In this research, I focus on how interaction and language are dynamically interconnected in the context of learning an endangered language.

Specifically, in this research I examine the first language (English) and the target language (Halkomelem) produced through interaction in two different but related kinds of pedagogical focus. I document language in use as primary evidence of the L2 in construction. I do not discuss what is being *learned*, or how it is being assessed, but instead documenting what language is being *used* in what particular participant frameworks. The focus is not on individual production but on observing co-constructed language use in participants' shared work to revitalize Halkomelem. Such an examination is required to document the state of language use as it is evolving through current pedagogical practices and the kind of language that is emerging out of these practices.

My analytic categories are drawn from the framework proposed by Seedhouse (2004). I use the same CA-based approach to examine the data from four classrooms in an endangered language context. I document the interactional choices arising out of activities with differing pedagogical foci. However, the particular categories of pedagogical focus varied from the situation described in Seedhouse (2004). This variation is predictable through CA because "actual conversation is always 'situated' - always comes out of, and is part of, some real sets of circumstances of its participants" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 699). I propose that a micro/CA-analysis can reveal how this

happens, that an ethnographic analysis can address why this happens (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 89). As such a CA-type analysis is a reasonable and useful first step to an empirically grounded understanding of a critically threatened language and to establishing an informed basis for making practical choices about programs.

CHAPTER 3: THE METHODOLOGY AND THE PROGRAM

In this chapter I situate my research within a specific community and pose specific research questions. In Section 3.1, I describe the site of the research and its participants. In Section 3.2, I describe the classes from which the data for this dissertation is drawn. In Section 3.3, I elaborate upon the research questions. These questions relate the emerging language constructions of speakers to classroom interactional patterns. A sketch of Upriver Halkomelem provides a background to the analytic categories used to describe the complexity of language use by the participants.

3.1 The Program

The language program that I investigated constitutes one administrative department of an Aboriginal Nation. The program was running a series of four introductory levels of Halkomelem language classes and an Intensive Fluency or Immersion Program. As well, the program includes courses from Simon Fraser University, through which students receive a Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency (the FNLPC) and university credit. The program also supports a variety of linguistic research projects conducted by individual researchers with support from outside grants. One band member, also a member of the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University at the time of research, had involved students in an ongoing e-mentor project (i.e., mentoring via the web), under the aegis of a grant. She was also guiding the students through an extended teacher training program within the Faculty of Education. At the time of research, the Director of the Halkomelem language program and the SFU faculty member were in the process of trying to establish SFU credit for these Education courses delivered through the program.

3.1.1 The participants

The participants included two native speaker consultants (elders), several instructors, and two cohorts of learners who were either teaching or preparing to teach in a variety of programs. I was also a participant researcher in all classes. One other

native speaker was involved with the e-mentoring project, which is not included in this data.

The term *native speaker* usually refers to speakers born into a speech community who use a language as their first or primary language. It approximates the notion of *fluent speaker*, which is defined by Ignace (1998, p. 14) as “people who could carry on and understand conversation...for as long as the situation required, with vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation that was acceptable to the audience and the elders.” However, the criteria for determining who is a fluent speaker are in flux in contexts of restricted use (Ignace, 1998, pp. 16-17). In this particular research context, there was a clear gap between the facility of the three remaining native speakers and the level of proficiency gained by the learners who expect to carry on the language.

3.1.2 The elders

Program participants constantly referenced the challenge of learning a highly endangered language. All Aboriginal languages in Canada are threatened to some extent, this language to a critical extent.²⁸ At the time of this study, only three native speakers of Upriver Halkomelem were involved in any work on the language and only two were involved with the language program.²⁹ These three speakers were the authorities and official knowers of the language. Program participants looked to them in all learning contexts as the authorities on procedural matters, protocol issues, and all aspects of the form and meaning of the target language. It is a huge loss that the elder speaker died in the spring of 2009.

The younger elder provided the bulk of the oral input of the target language to learners in the Language Immersion class (described in Section 3.2). She was also available to learners in the initial Language Review (LR) class (also described in Section 3.2) as they developed their self-introduction speeches. The elder modelled input for the in-class learning activities (a puppet show and pair work interview tasks) and was the primary source of input in the mentoring session with one student.

The more senior native speaker elder attended the Linguistics class, largely taking a role as witness to the proceedings rather than a role of active participant. However, the instructor used the elder’s own recorded voice in the class, as well as the

²⁸ The Assembly of First Nations (1992, p. 8) termed languages with fewer than 10 speakers *critical*.

²⁹ Subsequent to this research, program participants have identified two further people as fluent speakers, potentially available to help learners.

voice of her former partner (now deceased) in the Program. As a result, the CD ROM, with the recorded voices of the two elders, provided an additional interactant in the Linguistic class. As well as these voices, the computer program in use provided a built-in sound effect (which I have termed its *bling*).

3.1.3 The instructors/teachers

An important challenge for communities trying to revitalize endangered languages is that, increasingly, the instructors of the language are also learners of the language. This is unavoidable as communities lose the last speakers who were born with the language spoken around them on a daily basis, or these speakers become too frail to participate in language classrooms. Increasingly people with less fluency must take on teaching roles.

The primary instructor (called T) for the Language Immersion (LI) class was a *fluent understander*. This term is borrowed from Ignace (1998, p. 14) to refer to “people who could follow the details of a conversation, but who could not speak the language save for a small number of words or phrases.” The instructor’s mother was a fluent speaker. T had worked extensively with the elders and various linguists in the program. She had worked with the younger fluent speaker elder who was available to the students in class and who delivered most of the language input. T organized the flow of activities in the classes. She interceded between the elder, the learning materials, and the learners. She was primarily involved in setting up the justification for the activities performed by the participants.

The LR classes were run by the SFU faculty person, then in the Faculty of Education. She set up the course, invited me to deliver the language component, hired the elder, and introduced the first activity, taking a planning and guiding role for the LR class. I was invited to function as the default instructor, supported by the elder.

The instructor for the Linguistics classes was another non-native person, a linguist with a long association with the program, the elders, and the learners. Of the group of non-native speakers working on the language, the linguist-instructor had the strongest facility with the language’s spoken and written production.

3.1.4 The students

The students included two cohorts of adult language learners including about 17 people. The first group had committed many years of their lives to full-time³⁰ language study organized through this program. The second cohort was trying to learn the language with more restricted hours available, a problem that they addressed throughout the data. As well, some learners had worked with the native speakers, linguists, and other learners in a variety of staff roles.

The work done by all the participants in committing themselves to learn this language, often full-time over a period of years, cannot be sufficiently commended and supported given the overwhelming challenges they face. Students from the program have gone on to teach in community programs, band schools, the public school system, and at the local college. For example, at the time of this research, one student had initiated a popular community class³¹ and had recently begun to deliver introductory courses at the local college. Meanwhile, the first cohort of language students was undertaking a series of Education courses designed to ladder towards a Developmental Standard Term Certificate, to be approved by the British Columbia College of Teachers. As well, many of the students participated in a well-appreciated group of singers who performed at numerous community functions.

3.1.5 The researcher

I am a linguist with some background in a number of Aboriginal languages, experience in teaching English as a Second Language, experience teaching ESL teachers at the university level, and some years of experience both coordinating the SFU FNLP Certificate and teaching courses in the program. As a result, I was familiar with a variety of language learning programs and this program specifically. I asked for permission to carry out some classroom-based research with learners in various types of classes in the program and also offered to help develop some activities that might be interesting and useful for the participants. The Director of the program granted this permission and I was given complete support by everyone involved in the program. All participants gave signed permission to be taped and their conversations transcribed using an SFU-approved ethics consent form.

³⁰ This involved five full days a week of classes in the community-based program.

³¹ These classes continue to run in her community, years later.

I was then invited to run the language portion of the LR class within the Faculty of Education. The goal was to maintain the level of fluency that the learners had already established within the LI Program as they pursued professional teaching accreditation. As a researcher in the field of language acquisition, I was simultaneously learning the language, teaching the LR class, introducing new activities to the LI class, and undertaking observation and analysis of the process. I recorded and transcribed the class interaction, including my own participation, across its various contexts.

Because the teachers were also learners of the language, the institutional identities (using Seedhouse's phrase) of teacher and learner were constructed differently from the usual L2 learning context. These identities did not always correspond to those constructs as expressed in other SLA contexts. The notion that the 'teacher teaches the L2' (cf. Section 2.2.3) was not realized in the same way in this enterprise. The role of researcher, who was both sometime-instructor and current learner, was also constructed (and re-constructed) throughout the process of research, with all roles, or institutional identities, in flux.

The identities of instructor, researcher/learner, elder/authority, and learners are participant constructs. They were constructed through ongoing interactional choices and orientations of the participants. An analysis of how this was done provides a window on how these institutional identities were constructed through the talk of the participants, or 'talked into being'.

3.2 The language classes and data set

Table 3.1 outlines the data for this research. The data are drawn from eight classes and one mentoring session, which were all recorded and transcribed. I chose eight and a half hours of classroom discourse for the data set to illustrate the two pedagogical foci.³²

³² Seedhouse (2004, p. 87) noted that a reasonable database for classroom research into communication in both L1 and L2 classrooms is considered to be between 5 and 10 lessons.

Table 3.1: Language classes used in the analysis

Program	Class Dates	Class type	Time
Language Review (LR)	September 22, '03	Baseline class	16 minutes
	November 10, '03	Puppet show and interviews	1 hour
	November 17, '03	Interview reports	20 minutes
Language Immersion (LI)	September 26, '03	Baseline class	96 minutes
	October 3, '03	Speech preparation class	105 minutes
	October 1, '04	Jigsaw class	21 minutes
Linguistics 432	February 11, '04	Spelling with CD	78 minutes
	February 11, '04	Story and analysis	35 minutes
	February 18, '04	Spelling review	43 minutes
Mentoring	May 21, '05	Session with elder	37 minutes

The Language Review data were drawn from three classes. I chose the first class, on September 22, as the baseline class. The non-fluent native speaker instructor had given students a task to prepare speeches about themselves in Halkomelem and to work with the elder/native speaker to prepare them. The second and third classes were extended over November 10 and 17. During these class sessions the elder and I performed a puppet show in Halkomelem about getting up in the morning. We also provided a variety of subsequent tasks. These included (a) pair work for students to interview each other about their morning activities that day, and (b) an oral report of the interview results. The latter was designed so that students would change the second person question form and first person answer form to a third person narrative form.

The Language Immersion data come from three classes: (a) September 26, 2003; (b) October 3, 2003; and (c) October 4, 2004. I chose the data from September 26 as the baseline class because it represented the customary classroom interaction patterns and types of activities, prior to my contributions towards other activities. Typically, the instructor had the elder read out a carrier phrase from a phoneme chart (e.g. 'í is for *í:mex*') in the target language and then the students chanted back the phrase chorally. The students also worked through a textbook, reading out the sentences in turns³³. The other LI classes represented variations from this baseline class. In the October 3 class, a

³³ The text book was one of a series of introductory grammar materials developed within the community in partnership with a number of linguists, elders and community members. It followed an audiolingual method generally with isolated vocabulary, drills, brief dialogues, isolated language patterns and brief grammatical notes.

student rehearsed a speech with the elder for an upcoming wedding, with intensive line-by-line coaching from the elder of the learner's oral production. During this class, we also made a CD of the elder's voice for the student to practice with. Other students prepared other speeches for various events. In the final class a year later, I introduced an interactive jigsaw activity. Participants studied parts of a story about a couple quarrelling over the inequitable division of housework. Then they attempted to assemble the story in *jigsaw* groups and worked together to answer questions about the story. Finally, they answered questions about the division of labour in their own households.

The Linguistics class and mentoring session were both run through SFU's Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency (CFNLP), which I coordinate. The part-time resident linguist for the community taught the Linguistics class. In the February 11 class, he was reviewing a vocabulary list prior to a quiz. He projected Halkomelem words with some missing letters from a CD ROM learning aid on an overhead screen. He elicited from the students both the English translation and the spelling of the missing letters. In a further lesson, he presented a story on CD ROM told by one of the elders (now deceased) who had been a mainstay of the program's language work, also eliciting English translations of Halkomelem words.

The mentoring course (recorded in May, 2005) is an elective course of the CFNLP. This course involves a learner working face-to-face with a native speaker. For this particular class, the student and elder had spent several outings together, taking the skytrain downtown, doing a shopping circuit of second hand stores, and working outside washing wool, all the while using the target language as much as possible. The mentoring session included in this data was planned to present the results of their mentoring work to me, as the supervisor for the credit component of the course. The session took place in the elder's kitchen. When I arrived, they prepared a dessert, with the elder / mentor giving directions and the learner following the directions and writing them down. They then talked about the mentoring process. A major activity involved telling a traditional story with a pre-determined set of follow-up questions in the target language. We finished with a discussion, mostly in English.

Before explaining the proposed categories of analysis of the target language that was produced, I include a brief description of Halkomelem. This outline of the language reveals some of the challenges in determining these categories of analysis.

3.2.1 The language of Upriver Halkomelem: A brief description

The Halkomelem language is part of the Central Branch of the Salish language family. The Salish language family includes twenty-three languages. The Halkomelem area extends from South East Vancouver Island to Nanoose Bay, from the Fraser River delta to Harrison Lake and the lower Fraser Canyon (Suttles, 2004). Speakers of Halkomelem neighbour with people speaking Wakashan languages on Vancouver Island and with other Salish language speakers on the mainland.

There are three main dialect groups of Halkomelem. These are: (a) Island [hʌ-œʋmíñʋɹ], which includes Cowichan, Chemainus, and Nanaimo; (b) Downriver [hʌñœʋmíñʋɹ] or [hʌñœʋmíñʋm] from the Fraser River up to Stave, which includes Musqueam, Tsawwassen, Kwantlen, and Katzie; and (c) Upriver [həlœʋméyɹem] from Matsqui upstream, which includes Matsqui-Sumas, Chilliwack, Chehalis, and Tait. Linguistically, the Upriver dialect is most different from the Island dialect, with Downriver a link between the two (Suttles, 2004). Within these dialect groups, there are further slight dialectal differences from village to village or even between families.

The name *Halkomelem* is anglicized from the Upriver form. The name refers specifically to a linguistic category rather than a political identity. The traditional communities of the Upriver dialect area call themselves politically the Sto:lo and identify themselves as part of the Sto:lo Nation, from the Halkomelem word for 'river' (Galloway, 1993). The traditional downriver communities include the Katzie First Nation, the Tsawwassen First Nation, the Coquitlam First Nation, the Kwantlen First Nation, and the Musqueam First Nation. The Island communities include Cowichan, Chemainus, and Nanaimo dialects (Suttles, 2004).

The specific Halkomelem language program of this study has been supported by a number of linguists from three main B.C. universities and has had at least a part-time linguist on staff. As well as having a well-documented grammar (Galloway, 1993), the program has supported many academic papers and a body of pedagogically supportive documentation, including a draft English-Halkomelem dictionary, a series of pedagogical grammars, as well as a number of recent CD ROM productions. The following description is based on Galloway's exhaustive work on one dialect (1980, 1993).

3.2.1.1 The sound system and morphophonemics

Halkomelem has a series of contrastive aspirated and glottalic consonants at ten places of articulation, including a contrast at velar and uvular place, with plain and labialized articulation. This is typical of northwest coast languages and many others (e.g., Mayan). Like all coastal languages of British Columbia, the sound system includes a glottalic lateral affricate and voiceless lateral fricative, but unusually in one dialect (Upriver), only one nasal, /m/. In contrast to the presence of glottalic resonants in the other two main dialects, this dialect uses contrastive vowel length and tone. This unique development within Salish relates to a complex system of vowel ablaut and stress switch that alternates with many types of reduplication in a variety of morphophonemic processes. These include continuatives, resultatives, duratives, diminutives, plurals, or derivations (Galloway, 1993; Urbanczyk, 2001).

3.2.1.2 The morphology

Halkomelem has a highly complex inflectional and derivational morphology. Galloway (1993) has recorded ten sets of personal pronouns (identifiable as sets of clitics or affixes), a complex set of transitivizers which indicate various degrees of control, several verb aspect inflections for “continuative, noncontinuative, stative, resultative, durative, characteristic or dispositional, and perhaps inceptive” (Galloway, p. 166), as well as inflection for plural.

Nouns are generally derived verb roots, as is common in other Salish languages (Kuipers, 1974, p. 41). They are often derived with the pan-Salish nominalizer /s-/ or /sx^w-/ ‘something for’ (Galloway, 1993, p. 167). Nominals take one of a set of preceding determiners that grammaticalize visibility, proxemics, gender, animacy, deceased, indefiniteness, hypotheticalness, and plurality (Galloway, 1993, p. 168).

A noticeable typological characteristic of Halkomelem is a tendency toward verb-initial word order. Clause structure in Halkomelem, as in Salish generally, has three forms: the indicative, conjunctive (hypothetical or subjunctive), and nominalized forms (Kroeber, 1999).

Another salient aspect of this dialect of Halkomelem, which is common with other Salish languages, is the presence of lexical suffixes. These appear to be archaic forms of former lexical constructions, now absorbed into a verb root (Gerds & Hinkson, 1996) that have become detransitivized in the process. Of the over a hundred noted by

Galloway, these lexical suffixes frequently refer to body parts, literally or figuratively (Hinkson, 1999), numeral classifiers, and aspects of nature or material culture. Lexical affixes are the principle and productive means of word derivation (Galloway, 1993).

Nominalized clause complement constructions, often with possessive inflection after certain predicates, are characteristic of Halkomelem and other Salish languages. What are thought of as adverbs, adjectives or some particles in Indo-European languages may function as predicates in Halkomelem and trigger these nominalized complement constructions. The concept of word classes has been controversial in Salish (and Wakashan) linguistic studies (Kroeber, 1999), however, this topic will not be discussed further. In sum, Halkomelem is significantly different from English and other European languages. Halkomelem's rich consonantal system and complex morphology present challenges to teachers and especially to second language learners.

3.3 The Research

This dissertation documents empirically how different kinds of interactions involve different kinds of language production. Such work is certainly not a-theoretical, but it does allow initially a larger role to the data than to the theoretical constructs. This dissertation also responds to a call for more studies "where the data are collected in genuine classrooms" (Nunan 1992, also cited in Sodergard, 2008, p. 157) rather than in experimental or hypothetical situations. Although recent studies of, for example, immersion classrooms also meet this call, this study adds to our knowledge of classroom interaction by documenting what is happening in the context of one endangered Aboriginal language in some classrooms.

3.3.1 The research questions

The research questions motivating this study are:

1. What kind of Halkomelem is being produced in the four types of classes, (Language Immersion, Language Review, Linguistics and Mentoring) in classroom procedural talk and in doing a justification?
 - Specifically, what kinds of target language constructions are produced and how complex are these constructions?
2. What is the relation of the classroom interaction and the target Halkomelem language produced in the four types of classes in procedural talk and in doing a justification?

- Specifically, what kinds of turn-taking and repair foster or constrain target language production within these pedagogical foci?

In the following two chapters I explore the situation of one endangered language documented in a specific language program for a specific period of time through an analysis of: 1) the target language produced; and 2) the interaction involved, as seen through the interactional choices speakers made of turn-taking and repair.

3.3.2 The research method

This study was conducted over the course of more than a year of visits to the program, from September 2003 to May 2005. I recorded all sessions using a Marantz CDR300 digital CD recorder and Sony PZM sound grabber table-top microphone with a frequency response of 50 Hz to 16 kHz. Subsequently I transcribed all the CDs, listening with the i-Tunes program on a Mac OS-X computer.

I wrote the transcriptions using standard CA symbols and conventions, as represented in the Glossary. This system does not use the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), but represents spoken (English) language with some orthographic indications of normal fast speech reductions (e.g., *wanna* instead of 'I want to'), as well as including repetitions, partial words, hesitation markers, in-breaths, other non-linguistic sounds and pauses.³⁴ The assumptions are that all kinds of utterances may have significance in the work of interaction, that participants may orient to aspects of their utterances we cannot anticipate, and that a close examination of such a transcript will show which aspects speakers do attend to.

However, I only transcribed these fast speech reductions in Halkomelem when the point of the transcription was to indicate its non-target form in an emerging construction³⁵. I used the official Halkomelem community orthography, in which most letters have the corresponding IPA sounds, with the exceptions noted in the glossary. An English gloss is provided either in a column to the right of the Halkomelem utterances or on the line below for longer passages of connected speech.

After a pilot examination of the ratio of target language production to English in all pedagogical contexts, I extracted the examples of two types of procedural talk,

³⁴ Note that punctuation and capitalizations carry specific meanings in this system, which are different from English spelling conventions.

³⁵ However, cf. Ochs (1999), who explores the inherent biases and arbitrariness of any transcription system, who recognizes its filtering function and who argues for selective and less detailed transcriptions.

described in Sections 1.2.1 and 2.5, for detailed analysis. I determined these categories by repeated reading and then coding of the transcripts according to themes that emerged from the data. I chose data exemplars to illustrate different types of interactions in a procedural context and described them as having specific functions. The analytical categories that correspond to each research question are described in the next section.

3.3.3 The research focus #1: The analytic linguistic categories

As described in Section 2.2, I followed Tomasello (2003) in documenting the emergence of constructions within a group of speakers through real time interaction in the context of two kinds of procedural focus. I used Tomasello's general analytic categories for first language acquisition: simple to complex structures at the utterance level.³⁶ To some extent, the constructions can be described using the traditional units of linguistic analysis (e.g., nouns and verbs, word order patterns, and constructions such as passives, nominalizations, or idioms; Tomasello, 2003, p. 98). However, the complexity of other constructions is not as well served with these standard categories.

As described in Section 3.2.1.2, target language constructions in Halkomelem are morphologically complex. The management of this complexity is a major challenge for all participants of the language program and a significant factor in gaining proficiency in the language. It is not obvious to what extent learners have analyzed the Halkomelem constructions reported in the transcripts. Using Tomasello's terms, there are no observational criteria to establish whether constructions are formulaic (item-based utterances), limited-scope formulae, or if they include abstract 'argument-structure' constructions (Ellis, 2003; Tomasello, 2003). Consequently, I will note the complexity of production (i.e., usage) without necessarily imputing acquisition of grammatical relations per se. In fact, many utterances may illustrate morphologically unanalyzed forms, similarly to findings from some first language acquisition research (Berman & Armon-Lotam, 1995, quoted in Tomasello, 2003, p. 119). Accordingly, to avoid imputing unsubstantiated analyses, I have described target language utterances operationally and observationally as follows: names of people or the language, particles (*e'e*, *ewe*; *yes*, *no*), less than one word, one word, formulaic, phrasal, clause with one verb, or complex clause with more than one verb.

The particles primarily included *e'e* and *ewe* and therefore I use those Halkomelem words as the name for the category when reporting the results in Chapters

³⁶ From a social action perspective, this would be across TCUs.

4 and 5. Partial word productions may represent self-repair attempts, non-target attempts at producing morphologically complex words, or just confusion over the ordering of sounds in an unfamiliar word. I categorize utterances as one word if they are single nouns or occasionally single verbs and if the verb does not contain participant markings. Formulaic expressions include a small number of ritual expressions everyone uses, such as the Halkomelem equivalents of *hello*, *goodbye*, and *how are you*. A phrase typically refers to a noun phrase, that is, a noun with some additional identifying material. Clauses with one verb include participant marking and may include additional material, such as predicate adjective clauses. Complex clauses with more than one verb include what are traditionally described as subordinate clauses, and, occasionally, attributive clauses. Any other significant constructions, such as nominalizations, are noted in the discussion of target language production for each classroom.

3.3.4 The research focus #2: Interactional patterns of language production

My second research focus follows Seedhouse (2004) in describing how a pedagogical focus on procedure is reflected in its interactional organization. I provide data sets from each class within the two related pedagogical foci to link interactional choices and language production.

Further, within each procedural focus, I examine how participants specifically organize (i.e., orient to and exploit) the resources of turn-taking and repair (as explained in section 2.3.1). First, I examine how turns are allocated according to the structures of TCUs and TRPs, and how these turns are managed. Tables summarize who controls the topic, the types of sequences of turns, whether content of turns is locally-managed or pre-determined, and the specific language that is used. Next, I examine how repair is managed across activities within each pedagogical focus. I describe how participants organize repair, how they initiate it, mitigate it and orient to its outcome, what linguistic aspects they orient to and how the process is used to reach intersubjectivity.

Although Seedhouse (2004) only looks at the target language, arguing that only the L2 talks the language classroom context into being, I include some L1 use in the analyses. Much interaction does happen in the non-target language in a context where almost no-one speaks the language in question fluently. The focus of analysis regarding the language constructions that were produced, however, is primarily on the target language produced, except where a certain syntactic strategy is exemplified in English.

The data sets that are provided are not exhaustive and are only representative of the classes or interactions within them. The number of exemplars of procedural talk varied from class to class, from instructor to instructor, from activity to activity. For example, in a taping of 22 minutes and 7 seconds in the Language Review class of September 21, I recorded 68 seconds of procedural talk. In a taping of 23 minutes and 27 seconds in the Language Review class of November 10, I recorded 4 minutes of procedural talk. However, in the Linguistics class of November 11, there was probably less than one second of procedural talk. In general, more time was spent doing a justification than in setting up procedures. The purpose of this dissertation is not to quantify these distributions or to attempt to make predictions or generalizations about these distributions in other classes. Instead, the dissertation provides a precise, qualitative and grounded analysis of the details of talk in two different but related pedagogical foci in a variety of learning activities.

CHAPTER 4: PROCEDURAL FOCUS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I analyze the relation between interaction and target language produced in the first sub-variety of procedural talk: setting up and repairing procedure. Data are drawn from the nine classes described in Section 3.2. The analysis investigates the types of language that are produced in different types of interactions. First, I summarize the target language output by all participants in each class and classify it according to structural complexity. Then I provide data set examples³⁷ and descriptions of the interaction that produced this language. The data exemplars illustrate various functional types of procedural talk. I examine the examples for their interactional characteristics of turn-taking and repair to see how interaction is situated within, and constructs, specific social acts. A discussion section follows.

4.2 Language Review (LR) classes and procedural talk

Prior to the data recorded in the class of September 22, the First Nations non-fluent speaker instructor had assigned a task for participants to talk about themselves, their families, and themselves as current or future teachers of the language. The classes of November 10 and 17 had a number of preparatory tasks that provided opportunities to hear, read, rehearse, reformulate, and produce a few target language sentence patterns (e.g., *What did you do this morning? I [verbed] and [verbed]*).

4.2.1 Procedural language output: Analysis

Table 4.1 summarizes the number of utterances of procedural talk in the target language, by complexity and by speaker, for each example LR class. As explained in Section 3.3.3, the different categories are, with the abbreviated titles in parentheses: a) names of people or the language (name), b) particles (particle [in Figures] or e'e/ewe [in Tables]), c) less than one word (< 1 word), d) one word (1 word), e) formulaic

³⁷ The data sets do not include all procedural talk but do represent most instances in target language.

(formulaic), f) phrasal (phrase), g) clause with one verb (clause 1 verb), or h) complex clause with more than one verb (clause >1 verb). The speakers included an elder (E), me as de facto teacher (SR), and students (Ss).

Table 4.1: Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in LR classes

Date	Speaker	name	e'e/ ewe	< 1 word	1 word	formulaic	phrase	clause 1 verb	clause > 1 verb
Sept 22	E	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
	SR	-	-	-	(1)	-	1	-	-
	Ss	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nov 10	SR	1	-	-	4	1	-	3	-
	E	-	1	1	-	-	-	4	2
	Ss	-	1	2	2	-	1	9	1
Nov 17	E	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
	SR	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
	Ss	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-

Example types of target language output are listed below in Figure 4.1 for the September 22 class, in Figure 4.2 for the November 10 class, and in Figure 4.3 for the November 17 class. The examples illustrate different representative types of utterances. It should be noted that these figures are not listings of all of the tokens of Halkomelem language use.

Figure 4.4.1: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR September 22 class

SR	phrase clause 1 verb	kw puux (xwetes)	the book (read it?)
Elder	< 1 word particle	-thox e'e	to me? yes

Figure 4.4.2: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR November 10 class

Teacher		
formulaic 1 word clause (incomplete)	ey lateh, thutl'o, (.) xwe'it kw'as	good morning she what you did was
Elder		
clause 1 verb particle	xwithet, (.) thutl'o, e'e	got up, (.) she yes
Student		
clause 1 verb < 1 word phrase (conjoined)	tsel xwithet te teqatses xwe xwithet t'xem qas te ts'okwels qas te uh slheq'atses,	I woke up at five wo-woke 6 and (10) and uh 5
clause > 1 verb	otethet qesu wiqes quesu iq' thet te qelqéylem,	I stretched and then yawned and rubbed my eyes

Figure 4.4.3: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LR November 17 class

Teacher		
1 word particle clause > 1 verb	(texwsta) ewe? xwei(t) kw'es ewe iliyethest	(?) no? (what did she not tell?)
formulaic (idiom)	kwelh tu ey!	that's great!
Elder		
1 word particle clause > 1 verb	(texwsta) e'e ewe lil i yethest we lil xwe7it	(?) yes I did not tell what I did
Students		
name (lang.) phrase 1 word clause 1 verb clause (incomplete) particle	halkomelemqel ewete te thutl'o i li yethest i li chexw e'e	Halkomelem none she I told it? did you? yes

The language produced across classes varied from single words (the *e'eléwe* particles 'yes/no' and single word back-channels), Halkomelem names, some idiomatic

expressions and partial (apparently unanalyzed) repetitions of elder utterances. It included some of the most complex³⁸, although not quite target-like, learner language produced, when one student used a report of what she did in the interview task. Such language was conversational in its structural variety, even when incomplete or not quite target in form.

I recorded no target language about procedure from learners in the September 22 class, although the elder and I briefly co-produced a verb in Halkomelem in the course of procedural talk. In the November 10 class, procedural target language included Halkomelem names or single word utterances as well as the name of the task, *ey latelh*, 'good morning', and one non-target task prompt, *Name, xwe'it kw'as...* '(name), what you did was...'. One student's report on the procedure itself resulted in a larger number of clausal constructions in this class. She used *quesu*, 'and then' and *qas*, 'and' to create a complex conjoined clause. The student also attempted a goal-directed clause, *lam tsel te emetawt te xiwe*, 'I went to the bathroom to pee', in a report of who asked whom what, and what she replied.

In the November 17 class, students' procedural language exemplified the common particles as well as more complex language as they attempted to repair me through a misunderstanding with the elder. The elder also produced the most complex language with *ewe lil I yethest we lil xwe7it*, 'I didn't tell what I did'.

4.2.2 Interaction in LR: Data examples and description by class

In this section I describe the interactional patterns observed in the procedural talk in the three LR classes. In the LR classes procedural talk was used to clarify procedure, allocate procedure, modify procedure, excuse tasks not yet done, defer target language, report on procedure, and try to navigate a procedural misunderstanding. As well the teacher (SR) invited participants to take turns. (However, this is not included in the analysis).

4.2.2.1 LR Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples

Procedural talk is shown below in extracts 4.1 and 4.2. (The original procedural talk from the teacher was not recorded). The extract in 4.1 shows a discussion about a procedure, previously allocated by the teacher, which is internalized and reconstructed

³⁸ This claim is based on the classification of complexity as presented in this study.

by other participants. The interaction provides three examples of co-constructing meaning through strategically managing the turn-allocation system, using unfinished syntax within a TCU. (This has also been termed 'oral fill-in-the-blank', [Ray and Seely, 2005]).

(4.1) September 22, (LR): Co-constructing procedure: taking the syntactic bait

1. S1 Was this whole um like thing supposed to be um (1)
2. E its for 3 minutes
3. S2 mhm
4. S1 was it sposed to be um geared at (.) something?
5. S2 yourself? (.) and
6. E and your goals?
7. S2 whatever- your family? your-
8. S1 mhm that's me and my family and (.) what I'm doing?
9. S3 =you're a teacher, [yeah]
10. S1 and what I want to do,
11. S2 [yeah yeah that's it]
12. T mm and everything
13. S1 I dunno
14. ? yeah

In extract 4.1 the learners and the present elder clarify the procedure of the task in English. In line 1, S1 asks the other learners about the goal of the activity, which was to prepare a speech about themselves. She uses a syntactically unfinished TCU along with a pause, *supposed to be um (1)*, which functions by its very incompleteness to elicit

the next turn in line 2: *it's for three minutes*. In other words, the form of the utterance forces someone to take the syntactic bait, as it were.

S2's rising intonation and incomplete TCU in line 5 reflect the turn back to the elder in line 6. S2's rising intonation and incomplete TCU in line 7 cue a turn for S1 again to complete the TCU in line 8. Speakers co-construct the clarification of this task procedure using intonation and incomplete syntactical constructions, across lines 1-10, to the final round of qualified (provisional) acceptance in lines 11-14, *yeah yeah that's it, mm and everything, I dunno, yeah*. Using an unfinished syntactic form and rising intonation not only allocates a turn change but also scaffolds the content of the next TCU for the next speaker. Speakers use this strategy over several turns, completely in the L1.

In the second procedural interaction, in extract 4.2, a learner negotiates a new procedure for the self-introduction activity. She had prepared her speech first without help and here requests the elder to read her speech before the student tries to read it. Although I suggest she read it herself, the student negotiates³⁹ a modified procedure in an extended justification.

(4.2) September 22, (LR): Negotiating procedure now: "can you read this?"

- | | | | |
|----|----|----------------------------|------------|
| 1. | SR | <i>kwe puux!</i> | a book |
| 2. | E | ((laughter)) | |
| 3. | SR | <i>(xwetes)</i> | (read it?) |
| 4. | E | <i>-thox?</i> | (to) me? |
| 5. | S | can you read (xx) with me. | |
| 6. | E | hm? | |
| 7. | S | can you read this | |
| 8. | E | oh! <i>e'e</i> | oh, yes |

³⁹ The term *negotiate* is used here in the ordinary sense, rather than in the specialized sense of *negotiation of meaning*, as used in the second language acquisition literature.

9. S then I'll read it to see if I [know how to say all the words
10. SR [then you'll read it to he:r
11. E o:::
12. S and it don't know if it's right yet and I don't I didn't even want to try and memorize it if it was wro:ng
13. E o:[::
14. S [but I taped myself saying it?
15. E yeah, uhuh?
16. S and listened, (1.8) cuz I don't know if it's right
17. E mm
18. S and I have to change it, then I'll read it
19. S ((laughter))
20. E ((elder reads out student's speech in Halkomelem))

In extract 4.2 the student negotiates the proposed repaired procedure with an extended justification. In line 5, she proposes an alternate procedure to the one I proposed in Line 1, in which the elder would read out her speech instead. Both the elder's first query to the request in line 6, *hm?*, and the new information marker *oh*, delivered with some emphasis in line 7, indicate that the elder is not expecting this. When I propose in line 10 that the learner read her speech out to the elder, the learner does an extended justification for a procedural modification. She does not *know if it is right yet*. She does not *even want to memorize it if it is wrong*. By line 20 the learner has successfully negotiated the procedure to get the elder to perform her speech for her and correct it before she tries to speak any target language. This interactional work is carried out completely in English.

4.2.2.2 LR Classes #2 and #3, (November 10 & 17): Description and examples

The data excerpts represent the main types of procedural talk, not including brief directives from me, mostly in English. Just prior to extract 4.3 the learners had been reporting back to the whole class a summary of their interviews about their morning routines that day. The learner in extract 4.3 had spent the time on another more meta-linguistic line of investigation and defers her target language output for the assigned task.

(4.3) November 10, (LR): Negotiating delay in L2 output: "I'll tell you what I did in English".

1. SR (Name) *xwe'ít kw'es* (2) Name, what did you do?
2. S1 I did I did I couldn't I didn't do it I was just trying to work on mine but (.) I uh I haven't done it. I woke up at si- but I'll tell you what I did in English, I woke up at six [fifteen
3. All [((LAUGHTER))
4. S1 so *xwe xwithet* that's as afar as I gots (wo- woke)
t'xe qas te (ts'okwels) uh (1) 6 and (10?)
qas te (.0) slheq'atses, and uh 5
5. SR mkay
6. S1 okay.

In extract 4.3 the learner meets the literal requirement of the task to tell what she did this morning, by turning the exercise into a report in English. This negotiation is locally-managed over an extended time. In line 1 I request she report what her partner did. The learner suggests an alternative English language account in turn 2. Other learners orient to this suggestion as amusing in line 3 (in loud laughter) and the learner starts a tentative report in target language in line 4. However, due to constraints on the learner's production of the task at that time, the target language report is abandoned, also in line 4. However, a week later this learner spontaneously announced her report with, *I'll tell you what I did*, and gave a report in Halkomelem.

The data in extract 4.4 show a learner using a report on procedure itself to support language output in a narrative task. The student is giving a report of the interview task. The extract illustrates how a learner exploits procedural talk and the format of the allocated interview to meet the task requirements in general, but to use familiar structures that allowed her greater fluency.

(4.4) November 10, (LR): Procedure as resource: “(name) asked” (with morpheme glosses and translations)

1. S1 ((*xwe'it*)), ((*pe*))*tamet te* (Name),
do-what ask [name]
(xxx) (name) asked:
2. *í chxw xwe'it tl'o latelh, thet- thutl'o.*
aux.you do.what this morning say she
“what did you do this morning” she said.
3. *tse[xx] xwithet,*
I wake-up
“I woke up”
4. *otethet qesu wiqes qesu iq' thet te qelqéylem,*
stretch-self and then yawn and [rub] det. eyes,
“I stretched and then yawned and rubbed (the) eyes”
5. *lam tsel te emetawt (.) te xi xiwe qas (.)*
go I det. bathroom (?) p- pee and
“I went to the bathroom (to) pee and”
6. S2 ((laughter))
7. S1 *xixwet*
“pee-ed”.
8. e.o. ((LAUGHTER))

In extract 4.4 the learner turns the direction of the interview around by reporting that her partner asked her, *what did you do this morning?* and by re-enacting this as a dialogue, reports what she said she had done. Although the initial clause in line 1 is non-

target-like, S1 reports the procedure framing her interview in quasi-narrative, quasi-dialogue form: specifically, in line 1 with *(name) asked*, and in line 2 by reporting verbatim what she asked: *what did you do this morning? she said*. Then in line 3, she switches to her own voice in the dialogue, using the 1st person form: *I woke up....* This switch in perspective uses the task procedure itself as a resource, reporting who asked whom what and acting out how she answered, allowing her to avoid the pre-allocated form: specifically, to use the 3rd person form rather than 1st person form. Consequently, she uses the supplied text with the 1st person form to support her fluency.

The student's talk about the procedure itself is an original and creative use of the target language, strategically allowing her to exploit available syntactic forms to complete her turn and repair the allocated procedure. Acting out the procedure, and joining clauses with *qas*, 'and' or *qesu*, 'and then', facilitates a longer turn using more complex language.

The extract in 4.5 comes from the end of the interview report-back task, when the elder, who has been assisting in the interviews, points out that she has not reported what she did that morning. The data exemplify a failure in the co-construction of procedural repair.

(4.5) November 17, '03 (LR): A procedural train-wreck

- | | | | |
|----|----|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. | E | <and <i>ewe lili yethest</i> (.)
<i>we lil xwe7it</i> > | (and) I did not tell
what I did |
| 2. | E | <i>etl'</i> | eh? |
| 3. | S | <i>e7e</i> | yes |
| 4. | E | <i>uhuh</i> | |
| 5. | E | <i>ewe lil i yéthest</i> (.) <i>il xwe7it</i> (1.5) | I did not tell what I did |
| 6. | SR | ↓she did. Ah <i>ewe liliyethest</i> | (unanalyzed?) |
| 7. | E | < <i>ewe ili yéthest</i> > | I did not tell what I did |
| 8. | SR | <i>iliyethest?</i> | (?) |
| 9. | S1 | <i>iliyethest iliyethest</i> oh: | (?) |

10. S2 she didn't tell me (xxx)
11. S? oh
12. E ((laughter))
13. SR ((laughter))
ewe? xwei(t) kw'es ewe iliyethest no? she did
not (tell what?)
14. S <i li chxw> did you tell
15. S2 *yethest* is to tell (tell someone)
16. S1 *e7e* yes
17. SR oh! oh ! oh!

In the extract in 4.5, the elder and the students take over the role of instructor. They try to scaffold me through a lengthy repair in order to further the procedural requirement, assigned earlier by me.

Prior to extract 4.6, the students had been working together in pairs interviewing each other. One student was working on a linguistic question with the elder and me. In this extract I start by trying to assign turns to report on their interviews. Extract 4.6 involves a complex interaction that negotiates procedure serially with two learners and ultimately scaffolds target language production of the task. It moves from teacher-negotiated with the first learner to teacher-controlled with the second, switching from locally-managed talk to some measure of more pre-determined content of the talk

(4.6) November 10, (LR): Teacher & elder scaffold: "can you change it and say she did it?"

1. SR okay have you guys told each other what you're doing? Can we have a report back?
2. S1 I got preoccupied with this other thing
3. E [((laughter))
4. SR [a major spin [off] project yeah

5. S1 well but that's good to know because when to use them right,
there's so many ways to (.) command to go eat, come eat, go eat
6. SR so can we listen to each other now?
7. ? no
8. S1 *e'e* yes
9. SR well can we listen to those who are (1) up fer (3) we can start with
(.) can you guys (.) tell us what (Name) (.) did this morning? can
everybody listen now? (5)
10. S2 *kay>>tseł xwithet te teqatses [tl'o latelh]*
I woke up art. five o'clock this morning
'I woke up at five this morning'
11. SR [can you can you change it and say she did it?
so without the *tseł*? I
↓and then maybe we can ask (name) name
xwithet? wake up
12. S °*xwithet*? wake up
13. SR *thutl'o*? she
14. S °*thutl'o* she
15. SR if we wanna say she got – if
16. Ss ((whispered speech))
17. E *xwithet, (.) thutl'o,* she woke up
wake up she
18. SR *thutl'o, (.) she got up,* she
19. E *e'e* yes

is on target language production, but language switches are represented as a sequence; (e.g., L2-L1 represents target language production with a switch to L1).

Table 4.2: Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in LR classes

Data set	Class	Social acts	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU language
4.1 <i>taking the bait</i>	LR Sept 22	Clarify procedure	Co-constructed	Fill-in-the-syntactic-blank	Locally-managed	L1 output
4.2 <i>can you read this?</i>	LR Sep. 22	Negotiate procedure	S. controls	Request/consent	Locally-managed	L1 output
4.3 <i>I'll tell you...in English</i>	LR Nov 10	Defer procedure	T.attempts control	Adjacency pairs/invite-refuse/repair	Pre-determined then locally-managed	L2-L1-L2-L1 T question S one verb and numbers
4.4 <i>(Name) asked</i>	LR Nov 10	Modify procedure	S. controls	Monologue	Pre-determined	L2 narrative multi-clausal
4.5 <i>a train wreck</i>	LR Nov 17	Attempt to repair procedure	Elder-controls	complaint & clarification questions	Locally-managed	Complex clausal L2/ comprehension fails
4.6a (lines 11-19) <i>can you change it?</i>	LR Nov 10	Assign form of next TCU	T. directs Elder co-constructs	Adjacency pair/invite to speak-speak	Locally - managed	L1-L2 clausal
4.6b (line 20) <i>kay, xwithet thutl'o</i>	LR Nov 10	Report on procedure	S. reports	Monologue	Partial pre-determined	L2/clausal

Although extract 4.1, *taking the bait*, had no target procedural language from learners, the data exemplified a particular turn-taking strategy of using unfinished syntax with rising intonation in the TCU. This both elicited help from co-participants, triggered some next speaker turn, and to some extent determined the content of the next

turn. Cyclical use of this strategy throughout the extended turn demonstrated how procedure was co-constructed over several voices and several turns.

Extract 4.2, *can you read this*, with no target language after my non-target attempt to direct procedure, illustrated a learner negotiating procedure in the L1 through local management of turn-taking. The learner rejects a proposed distribution of turns and negotiates a better fit to her current comfort with (delayed) target language production by getting the elder to read out her draft speech first.

Procedural talk with some target language includes every possible interactant taking a turn to control the topic. In extract 4.3, *I'll tell you in English*, the teacher (SR) and a student negotiate a delayed production for the learner's turn.

In extract 4.4, *(Name) asked*, a learner manipulates the form of the content of her TCU into a narrative 'telling'. This could also represent my inexpert teaching, but regardless, the interaction is mostly locally managed with open-ended turn-taking, within the constraints of an assigned task.

In extract 4.5, *a train-wreck*, the elder raises a problem with the execution of the procedure, in which she had not yet had a turn to do a telling. The moment-by-moment management of turn-taking within this interaction allows a shift in roles, but without a successful repair in this interaction.

In extract 4.6, *can you change it*, learners negotiate a procedural question of whether an activity will take place using local management of turn-taking, whereas I co-construct the repair of the target form of the activity with the elder and student in lines 11-19. The student then uses a specific pronoun, *thutl'o*, and specific word order (*Verb-Subject*). This interaction is jointly constructed over ten turns with various insertions and expansions, cycling through various voices.

Overall, throughout the data sets, the control of topic is fluid and sensitive to ongoing or local management. However, negotiating these locally-managed turns involved some L1 for everyone. The procedural talk in the baseline class was carried out entirely in English, the extensive negotiation and justifying used by participants in that class requiring native speaker fluency to manage. Also, the second pair part of refusing or postponing an invitation to participate in extract 4.3, *I'll tell you in English*, required native speaker fluency, until a display phrase indicated the extent of the target language preparation, in line 4 of extract 4.3. Even the elder abandoned, with laughter, her attempt to repair the procedure in extract 4.5, *a train wreck*. Only a portion of extract 4.6a,

can you change it, was in Halkomelem, when the elder and I modelled the target construction. The rest of the invitation to speak and the repair offer were in L1. Similarly, the final utterance in extract 4.6b, *kay, xwithet thutl'o*, represented the end of the procedural talk and the beginning of the L2 task talk. In this final class, the target language input from the teacher and elder was quite minimal after the initial puppet show. The chart indicates that the most complex TCUs for students were delivered, after one initial repair sequence, as monologues. These turns, including complex clauses, are of course associated with a suspension of turn-taking.

4.2.4 Repair in procedural context in LR classes

In the following section I describe how participants repaired procedural talk in the LR classes observed and the kinds of target language they used. I examine the trajectory of repair; specifically, whether interactants self-repair or other-repair, and which participant initiates the repair. I describe types of repair, without claiming them as classificatory types but rather as post hoc descriptors of what happened in this context. Table 4.3 summarizes the talk doing repair of procedure in the LR classes.

Table 4.3: Repair characteristics of procedural talk in LR classes

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
4.1 <i>taking the syntactic bait</i>	(LR) Sept 22	S-I O-R	Shared	L1/unfinished syntax
4.2 <i>can you read this?</i>	(LR) Sept 22	S-I S-negotiated	Student-directed	L1
4.3 <i>I'll tell you what I did</i>	(LR) Nov 10	O-I S-R	Laughter as repair	H: 1 Verb + numbers
4.4 <i>(Name) asked</i>	(LR) Nov 10	S-I S-R (meta-repair)	Use procedure as resource	L2: 8 clauses/verbs with qas coordinator
4.5 <i>a procedural train-wreck</i>	(LR) Nov 17	O-I multiple-O-R	Breakdown	L2: mostly (main clause + subordinate clause)
4.6 <i>can you change it?</i>	(LR) Nov 10	O-I joint-R	Negotiation & joint repair	L1 & L2/clausal in translation

The interactional gambit of using incomplete syntax with rising intonation in the TCU served two functions in extract 4.1: to trigger turn-taking and to co-construct a procedural repair. Learners and elder jointly clarified the purpose and format of the task.

The interaction in extract 4.2, *can you read this?*, involved a repair of the proposed turn-taking in lines 1-4. The learner managed to delay her turn and justify the delay in terms of making sure the language was accurate enough for her to learn.

In extract 4.3, *I'll tell you what I did in English*, the learner began a non-target language telling of her morning. Her response to my question-cum-invitation to produce a target language report indicates she was orienting to a focus on meaning rather than on the form of the task. That is, she was focusing on the telling rather than the language aspect, (i.e., to do it in Halkomelem). However, this attempt was greeted by laughter, which the learner treated as an other-initiated repair, and she attempted to switch to target language in line 4.

I termed the extract in 4.4, *(Name) asked*, a meta-repair. A student altered the format of the task by giving a procedural report rather than doing a repair of the language form. The learner delivered the repair in a self-initiated, self-repair trajectory to reconstruct the form of the procedure and to facilitate her target language monologue.

Extract 4.5, *a procedural train-wreck*, exemplifies a lengthy breakdown in procedural repair over 17 turns. The elder conducts an other-initiated multiple-other-repair trajectory in the target language, using both simple and complex clauses. A learner also provides some strategic translation in L1. Specifically, I give no appropriate response in line 2 in a second pair part to a complaint, *ewe lil i yethest* (.) *we lil xwe7it*, 'I didn't tell what I did', to either recognize the elder's complaint or offer a repair. By line 5 the elder (E) undertakes a lengthy repair between the students and me, the current 'instructor'. The students indicate comprehension sooner in a series of partial translations. I display processing trouble with lowered volume and phrasal echoing in line 6. I respond in line 8 using rising intonation with another repetition of a lexical chunk, *iliyethest?* 'I did not tell'. When a student extracts the verb root specifically, *yethest is to tell*, in line 15, I give three tokens of the receipt of new information: *oh, oh, oh!* in line 17. However, as I still do not ask the elder to tell what she did, and do not orient to the initial complaint, it appears I have not yet analyzed the string of sounds. The repairable remains un-repaired and intersubjectivity about a problem in the execution of the procedure fails in this instance.

The final turns (lines 11-20) of extract 4.6, *can you change it and say she did it*, exemplify a configuration of repair that is possibly unique to this context. Its trajectory takes a cyclic form of co-construction, which enables everyone to agree on the appropriate target language form. The repair flows from (a) my indication in turn 11 that there is a repairable, with a suggestion of an appeal to the elder, *maybe we can ask*, to (b) the proffered other-repair in turns 11 and 13, *thutl'o*, repeated sotto voce by a student in turns 12 and 14. I restate this focus on the third person form: *if we wanna say she got*; and (c) the elder reiterates this focus with the final modelled repair in turn 17: *xwithet, thutl'o*. In turn 18, I focus again on the repairable, *thutl'o*, and the authoritative voice of the elder confirms this repair again in turn 19. Then, in turn 20, the student produces the target and authorized form, indicating this completed repair with *kay*. The final target language produced is at the clausal level. Repair is achieved through a cycle of voices as the instructor proposes the repair and the elder repeats the repair, thereby sanctioning it. The learner orients to this cyclic repair trajectory by then producing the modeled target form. This trajectory seems to authorize the non-native instructor to provide some input and focus to the learning activity, while ensuring a proper ratification of the form of the language by the native speaker. It is a characteristic interactional pattern in this context.

The procedural talk in this class that involved self-initiated repair was almost entirely in the L1. Procedural talk with target language repair, at least in these examples, involved other-initiated repair, mostly with other-repair.

4.2.5 Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in LR

Seedhouse (2004, p. 133) found little participation from learners in a procedural context, and that procedural talk was “overwhelmingly delivered in (teacher) monologue” with “a very high degree of homogeneity...with no turn-taking at all” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 139). In contrast, I found in my data that the procedural context was talked into being by various participants and many different types of procedural talk. Although teachers managed procedure through teacher monologues and brief directives or invitations, other interactional patterns emerged. Instructors or an elder asked clarification questions, and all participants undertook more extensive negotiation than indicated in Seedhouse’s data. Although Seedhouse does not specifically discuss repair in a procedural context, these data indicate considerable procedural repair in the context of a focus on procedure and extensive collaborative repair as participants refuse or negotiate procedure, negotiate over time, or even fail completely to repair procedure.

The nature of what is repairable in a procedural context differs from other contexts. As well as repairables in the talk, agreement on what is the nature of the procedure itself is a potential repairable.

Both a trajectory of self-initiated other-repair and teacher-initiated peer-repair have been noted as typical of L2 classroom repair, specifically, in a form-and-accuracy context (van Lier, 1988, p. 201, also cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Seedhouse (2004) contrasts these trajectories with the typical repair trajectories of ordinary conversation. He claims the former are pedagogically useful for allowing learners greater *interactional space* and more opportunities for both speaking and listening to target forms. These trajectories give teachers valuable feedback on learner progress, and foster supportive and cooperative learning. Seedhouse attributes this typical classroom repair trajectory to the fact that the teacher is in a privileged position to evaluate the learner's output. The data in this dissertation illustrate, however, that in this particular context, when the teacher is not able or authorized to evaluate output, that participants have adapted a repair strategy to reflect that.

It is uncertain from this analysis whether learners fail to self-repair in the target language because they do not feel authorized to self-repair when more competent others (i.e. elders) are present, or whether they cannot self-repair. The former would suggest that learners are always acolytes, never equal participants. At any rate, this cyclical repair trajectory differs from everyday interaction in which people share responsibility for interpreting and constructing meaning.

Although the repair trajectories found in these data differ from Seedhouse's data, this variation in repair trajectory exemplifies Seedhouse's thesis that each context has its own interactional organization that reflects its own pedagogical focus. This is seen in extract 4.6, in the shift in the nature of the repairable and the nature of the repair, when the pedagogical focus moves from a focus on whether to proceed to a focus on how to proceed. Both the turn-taking and repair take a different form for each activity. In the first part, in turns 1-10, there is a sequence of adjacency pairs negotiated between instructor and learners. In the second part, in turns 11-20, the form for the content of an elicited TCU from the student is co-constructed through a coordinated other-directed repair technique as the elder and I jointly pre-allocate the target output. This pattern of co-constructed repair, other-initiated+elder-confirmed other-repair, is perhaps unique to this learning context where access to knowledge is differentially shared and owned among interactants.

In the instance when the learner produces the most extensive target language in procedural talk, the scaffolded repair system is finally withheld in favour of a monologic learner-turn. We can witness interaction supporting speaking Halkomelem by its own sequential organization, first managed through a spiraling of turn-taking and repair, followed by the suspension of turn-taking and repair in a sustained learner turn.

The two weekly lessons of focused learning activities provided a fair amount of repetitive input of some limited vocabulary and sentence structures. The weekly sessions also gave a context for asking referential rather than display questions (Nunan, 1996, p. 88), thereby co-constructing meaning. Both the frequency of input and opportunity to contextualize these constructions possibly provided sufficient opportunity to store them as linguistic units and enable later production at the clausal level. The final suspension of turn-taking in this extended task fostered a quasi-narrative form, or performance context, for learners to take their time, incorporate humour, tell their own stories, and develop their own voices in Halkomelem.

4.3 Language Immersion classes and procedural talk

The Language Immersion program, as described in Section 3.2, was a community-delivered program. The data below represents the target language output by all participants in the three classes in the context of talking about procedure, with one example of non-procedural talk used as a contrast.

4.3.1 Procedural language output: Analysis

Table 4.4 summarizes the number of utterances of procedural talk in target language, by complexity and by speaker, for each example LI class.

Table 4.4: Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in LI classes

Date	Speaker	e'e/éwe	< 1 word	1 word	formulaic	phrase	clause 1 verb	clause >1 verb
Sept 26	E	1	-	2	1	1	-	-
	T	-	-	2	2	-	2	-
	Ss	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oct 3	E	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	T	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Ss	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
Oct 4'04	E	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
	T	-	1	-	-	-	3	-
	Ss	1	1	-	-	-	2	-

As Table 4.4 indicates, target language output in procedural context is quite restricted. All participants produce *e'e*, 'yes', and *ewe*, 'no', as well as a few contributions of word fragments, single words, a formulaic 'carrier phrase' for reciting the phoneme chart and a few verbs. The types of target language output are listed in Figure 4.4, by class.

Figure 4.4: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LI September 26 (baseline class)

<i>Elder</i>		
1 word	aléts'e	where
phrase	sqwélqwel sexete isá:le	words (section) two
particle	éwe?	no?
<i>Teacher</i>		
phrase	yeah s'íwes letse	yeah, lesson one
formulaic	í xwelám te í:mex,	ímex is for walking

Target procedural language produced in the baseline class was largely single words, word fragments, or short phrases. The teacher used one phrase, *í xwelám te í:mex*, to set up the task of chanting the phoneme chart. This formulaic but clausal carrier phrase then framed the output for the following turns for all participants.

Figure 4.4 also shows language produced when the elder and instructor were clarifying where they were in a task to read aloud some new words and phrases. Their

language here also consisted of single words or phrases, (a section title of the text), used in a context to clarify the procedure.

Figure 4.5: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LI October 3

<i>Elder</i>		
clause > 1 verb (nominalized subordinate)	e' stl'i kw'els kwixet?	you want me to read?
particle	e7e	yes
<i>Student</i>		
clause 1 verb (echo)	° e' stl'i kw'els kwixet	you want me to read?
clause 1 verb	kwixet? chexw?	read? You?

The language in the October 3, 2003 class was notable for the amount of extended target language output in the task part of the lesson. Learners and the elder produced hours of Halkomelem words, reformulated parts of words and echoed phrases and clauses in an intense and focused coaching session to rehearse a speech for an upcoming wedding. However, students in this class produced relatively little procedural talk. Although the bulk of their task-related classroom talk was in Halkomelem, the minimal procedural talk was in their L1. The elder, however, produced a complex construction, a potential pivot phrase, *e' stl'i kw'els* (*verb?*), 'do you want me to (verb)...?'; in this instance, 'do you want me to read it?'. One student followed the elder's clarification question, shown in Figure 4.5, with an echoic response, also describable as private speech. Another student then appeared to ask a clarification question.

The procedural language in the final jigsaw class a year later was in a mixture of L1 and L2 from me, L1 and L2 from a learner, and target language from the elder. The learner was attempting a lengthy repair to clarify and negotiate the jigsaw task. He rejected an interview question about buying groceries and made an alternate but non-target-like offer. During this negotiation, the learner used several attempts, if non-target-like, to complete the task in target language. His output was in single words but his target language attempts were morphologically complex and reached through a series of phonologically similar attempts, from *xwexwiltem* to *tsexwel* and *ts'exwelmx*, before the elder displayed her recognition of his intention and repaired it with the target form: *th'exwélwètem*, 'doing laundry'.

Figure 4.6: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus, LI, October 4, jigsaw task

Instructor		
1 word clause 1 verb	th'exwel- th'exwílep li chexw i:qwethet tl'owayel	wash- wash floor? did you sweep today
Elder		
1 word particle	oh- th'exwélwètem e'e, ey	do laundry yes, good
Student		
word (non-target verb) particle	tsexwel, tsexwelm ewe	(do laundry) no
word (echo verb)	th'exwélwètem	do laundry

The learner's non-target language attempts at *th'exwélwètem*, 'do laundry', shown in Figure 4.6, are very close to two probably more familiar words: *sléxwelh*, 'canoe' and *xwélmexw*, 'First Nations person'. As illustrated below in line 10 in extract 4.11, the student's pronunciation improved after he received a clear model to copy. This student managed to control the interview task topic using quite minimal target language. However, an extended subtask of the jigsaw activity, to discuss what one character should do if her partner did not help more with the housework, provoked very heated discussion that continued in English.

Although minimal, target language in procedural focus in the LI classes varies from formulaic cues, in the case of the chanted carrier phrase in the baseline class, to brief but related adjacency (question-answer) pairs in target form. These include one complex clause with a subordinate clause by the elder, *el stl'i kw'els kwixet?* which students work out within the context of figuring out who needs to do what. As well utterances in the jigsaw task included some verbs with lexical suffixes (e.g., *th'exw-ílep*, 'floor-wash'), which could be clausal but more likely were unanalyzed by the learners in this context. Language also broke down into the learner's L1 under a too compelling task condition. The target language, however, functioned to solve real problems of how participants were carrying on their classroom activities. During this talk, interactants find their place, organize their turn-taking in a classroom task and control the topic of discussion, all in Halkomelem.

4.3.2 Interaction in LI: Data examples and description by class

In this section I describe the interactional patterns observed in the procedural talk in the three LI classes. Procedural talk was used to clarify procedure, cue up procedure, negotiate procedural format, usually in the L1, and to clarify where people were in the proceedings, how they were proceeding, and what exactly the task was. Overall, procedural talk functioned as problem-solving talk about how to do what was being undertaken in the classroom.

4.3.2.1 LI Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples

Prior to the exchange in extract 4.7, the teacher had given a lengthy justification of the need to practise the sound system of Halkomelem and a warning of how preceding students were limited by a pedagogical focus on too much spelling. She had just indicated that they would read the phoneme chart out loud after hearing the elder.

(4.7) September 26, '03 (LI): Pre-allocated talk: the phoneme chant

1. E so how do you want it? do you want it uh *i*?
2. T ↓ *i xwelám te í:mex*,
3. E Okay
4. T *ímex* is for walking,
5. E (4) ↑ *i* (1) *xwelám te í:mix* (2)
6. Ss *i xwelám te í:mix* ((staggered chorus))

Extract 4.7 illustrates two types of procedural interaction. In the first the elder asks the instructor a clarification question in line 1 about the form of the pre-allocated carrier phrase for chanting the phoneme chart, *so how do you want it...* In the second type, the instructor (T) models the proposed structure of the turns in line 2, *i xwelám te ímex*, '*i* is for (X)'. The instructor follows the predetermined target language carrier phrase with her own additional turn to provide the translation in line 4. This exchange is withdrawn from the ongoing talk by lowered pitch, that is, it is delivered as an aside to the elder. The start of the performance of the assigned task to use the clarified, pre-

determined turn content is indicated with raised pitch by the elder in line 5, after a 4 second gap. The students orient to this change in focus from procedural to task-related by joining in the now public chant in line 6. Both types support the teacher-controlled interactional dynamic of the following task.

Another procedural interaction is illustrated in 4.8. The instructor and elder clarify where they are in the task using mostly target language and by specifically orienting to chapter heading numbers and titles.

(4.8) September 26, '03 (LI): Problem solving: clarifying where we are

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. | T | oh. we're back in [we're back in= | |
| 2. | S1 | [see | |
| 3. | T | um | |
| 4. | E | <i>aléts'e</i> | where |
| 5. | T | ((whispered)) <i>aléts'e</i> | where |
| 6. | E | > <i>sqwélqwel sexete isá:le</i> | words (section) two |
| 7. | T | [xx] | |
| 8. | E | <i>éwe?</i> | no? |
| 9. | T | yeah <i>s'íwes letse=</i> | lesson one |
| 10. | E | OH ((laughter)) okay | |

In extract 4.8 the elder and teacher determine over several TCUs where they are according to chapter heading numbers and titles. They accomplish this using mostly target language.

4.3.2.2 LI Class #2, (October 3): Description and examples

Another co-constructed, locally-managed interaction is illustrated in extract 4.9, from the October 3, LI class. Prior to this interaction the learner had presented the elder with her draft wedding speech.

5.	S	<i>eʷe u[m</i>	no, um
6.	SR	[ah (2)	
7.	?	°hhh	
8.	SR	well how bout (.) how bout <i>ileqels te s'[elhtel</i>	to buy groceries
9.	S	[oh se tsexwel- oh. ts'e xwelmex.	(??)
10.	E	<i>o::: <th'exwélwètem></i>	oh , do laundry
11.	S	° <i>th'exwélwètem</i>	do laundry

The student's turn in extract 4.11 in line 1 has a series of pauses; an attempt at a target language production, *xwexwiltem*, which is not understood as *th'exwélwètem*, 'doing laundry'; and a request for help. My suggestions in line 4 and 8 about washing the floor and shopping are both rejected. In line 9, he continues to orient to his first target language attempt, which is still not recognized. The attempted word has moved from *xwexwiltem* in line 1, to *tsexwel* and *ts'exwelmex* in line 9. The elder then displays her recognition of what the student means: *o::: th'exwélwètem*, 'oh, do laundry'. The student repeats this correctly, sotto voce, in line 11. The interaction is locally-managed and for the learner, is largely in target language.

In contrast, extract 4.12 illustrates a non-procedural example of locally-managed talk from the most interactive part of the jigsaw task. In this task students were discussing possible repercussions for husbands who do not shoulder an appropriate share of household tasks and were asking, specifically, who does what housework in their homes and how often.

(4.12) October 4, 2004 (LI): How often do you do the laundry?

1.	SR	<i>sth'exwelwetem chexw?</i> (1) <i>lheli[kwes?</i>	you do laundry sometimes?
2.	E	<[lheli:kwes>	sometimes

- | | | | |
|----|----|-------------------------------|------------|
| 3. | SR | <i>lheli:kwes?</i> sometimes? | sometimes? |
| 4. | S | mm ah | |
| 5. | S | <i>ʔheli:kwes</i> | sometimes |
| 6. | E | °oh | |
| 7. | S | all the time | |

Extract 4.12 exemplifies an interaction that moves from target language to L1, and which eventually continues into a lively discussion in English (not provided in this excerpt). The learner's switch from target language to L1 in line 7 illustrates a potential pragmatic constraint on target language talk in a classroom context. Talk that involves the learners on a very personal level may limit the language learning potential of some activities. Such an example, conversely, may explain the relative usefulness of procedural talk in fostering and supporting target language interaction.

4.3.3 Turn-taking in procedural context in LI classes

In this section I describe the turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in the LI classes, as described in Section 4.2.3. Table 4.5 summarizes the turn-taking characteristics in the LI classes.

Table 4.5: Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in LI classes

Data set	Class	Social acts	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
4.7 <i>i is for imex</i>	HI Sept 26	Clarify procedure & cue up task	Elder question	Adjacency pairs/ clarification request	Pre-determined	L1+ L2 chanted carrier phrase
4.8 <i>where are we?</i>	HI Sept 26	Locate task text	T. + Elder	Co-constructed repair	Locally-managed	L1-L2
4.9 <i>you want me to read?</i>	HI Oct 3	Clarify format	Elder	Adjacency pair/ clarification question	Locally-managed	L2
4.9 <i>you want me to read?</i>	HI Oct 3	Focus on form	Student	Private speech?		L2 echoic clause
4.9 <i>read you?</i>	HI Oct 3	Focus on meaning?	Student	Confirmation question	Locally-managed	L2
4.10 <i>it goes good with me</i>	HI Oct 3	Negotiate procedure	S proposes & negotiates	Extended offer and acceptance	Locally managed	L1
4.11 <i>I'm lost</i>	HI Oct 4, 04	Clarify task	Student controls	Adjacency pairs: Request-offer, reject-re-attempt	Locally managed, content pre-determined	L1+L2 L1-L2
4.12 <i>all the time</i>	HI Oct 4, '04	Present self as responsible	All participants control	Adjacency pairs: Question -answer	Locally-managed	L2+L1

As seen in Table 4.5, most procedural talk in the Immersion classes was locally managed, except in the initial class with its ritualized chanting of the phoneme chart. Participants managed turns in response to their ongoing functional needs, within a context of focusing on learning Halkomelem.

So, for example, although the procedure for the activity in extract 4.7, *i is for imex*, was pre-determined, the procedural topic was sensitive to a real-world issue, namely, how did the instructor want the elder to do this activity? Using lowered pitch to move their interaction aside the classroom task, the elder and teacher established how the instructor wanted to format the choral reading of the phoneme chart. Subsequently, they cued-up the pre-determined turn-taking and content of the following choral chant, using modal voice.

In extract 4.8, *where are we*, when the elder's TCU consists of a question word in line 4, which is a powerful turn changing technique, the instructor does not respond in line 5 with the answer as would be expected, but repeats the question. This reflected question triggers the turn exchange system, encouraging someone else to provide the answer, which the elder does herself in line 6, using target language. T follows with further clarification in line 9. Neither the turn-taking nor form of these questions are pre-determined. It is the participants, in this case the teacher and elder, who get lost, negotiate their learning space, find themselves, and get back on task in target language.

In addition, each of the four participants in extract 4.9, *you want me to read?* is forging her own understanding of the previous turns of the others. When the elder asks in target language if the instructor wants her to read, she really needs the instructor's response to know that. Within the overall focus on procedure in this interaction, there seems to be a focus-on-form insertion sequence. One student recasts the construction sotto voce. However, when the next student asks in line 4 *kwixet? chexw*, 'read? you?', the elder treats that as a genuine question. Whether it was a clarification question: *does 'e' stl'i kw'els kwixet* mean *kwixet chexw?* or a request: *you read?*, she answers *e'e* 'yes' (to both?) and proceeds to read out the speech.

In extract 4.10, *it really goes good with me*, a student proposes and negotiates the procedure of her coaching session to maximize her on-task target language output, using an extended mitigated request. She does this in her L1, perhaps because the delicacy of the negotiation requires the greater skill of native language fluency. The turns reflect a series of increasingly mitigated requests. These vary from (a) within turn pauses, (b) a TCU with decreased volume in line 3, (c) a hedging word, *maybe*, in line 5, and (d) a supportive turn from me in line 6, which she treats as sufficient agreement, *okay*.

In extract 4.11, a student elicits the required target language word to ask someone how often they do the laundry. In this interaction, the student firmly controls

the topic, the output language, and ultimately his choice of procedure. Although my attempts in lines 2-8 to offer other target language questions do not fit his immediate goal, the learner perseveres in reformulating his own target language question, rather than accepting an alternate question. His goal is co-constructed and repaired through a locally managed interaction.

Extract 4.12 illustrates a possible trigger to switch from target language back to L1. I ask the learner how often he does the laundry and after a brief pause suggest *lhelikwes* 'sometimes'. The elder then corrects my vowel length, switching to a focus on form, and I reiterate the repaired form and then translate it. When the learner subsequently repeats *lhelikwes*, sotto voce, the elder treats this as his answer, by her *oh*. He orients to this as a repairable and immediately corrects this in English, switching to a focus on meaning: *all the time*. I suggest that the imperative of the adjacency pair sequence (to answer a question that could put oneself in an odious light if not answered) provides a strong disincentive to carry on in target language when the (moral) imperative to reply overrides the immediately accessible linguistic wherewithal to do it.

Most target language utterances that focus on procedure in the LI classes were by the instructor and elder. Learners largely negotiated procedure in L1. However, this target language modeling may have contributed to making the target language more comprehensible by providing contextualized utterances for the learners, within which some people made some attempt to scaffold their own comprehension, (e.g. excerpt 4.9, lines 3 & 4).

Overall, in a focus on procedure, all the participants controlled the development of the topic across all the LI classes. In addition, participants organized the sequencing of turns according to their function. That is, turn-taking reflected genuine needs to coordinate activities in this language-learning context and to establish, clarify or repair the procedure. In the first class, in contrast to the target language produced in the actual learning tasks of choral chanting, the procedural talk was more conversational, or 'authentic', in the communicative language teaching sense, (see Section 2.4.2).

4.3.4 Repair in procedural context in LI classes

In the following section, I describe some characteristics of repair in the LI classes in a procedural context. Table 4.6 presents the type of repair, the repair trajectory (both self-repaired and other-repaired), and the language produced in the LI classes.

Table 4.6: Repair characteristics of procedural talk in LI classes

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
4.7 <i>i is for imex</i>	(LI) Sept 26	S-I O-R	Elder question	L1-2: Teacher-allocated carrier phrase
4.8 <i>where are we?</i>	(LI) Sept 26	S-I S-R	Elder elicits /procedural resource	L2: question word & lesson headings
4.9 <i>you want me to read?</i>	(LI) Oct 3	S-I O-R	Elder question	L2: echoed clause & clarification question
4.10 <i>it goes good with me</i>	(LI) Oct 3	S-I O-R	Student procedural request	L1
4.11 <i>I'm lost now</i>	(LI) Oct 4 '04	S-I O-R→ S-I-S-R	Student repairs repair	L2: 1 word attempts
4.12 <i>all the time</i>	(LI) Oct '04	O-I-S-R	Student clarifies	L2-L1

The data illustrate both other-repair and self-repair trajectories for procedural repair. Repair is self-initiated in all but one case.

In extract 4.7, the elder and instructor coordinate both a procedural repair and a switch from a procedural aside to the public choral part of the interaction, using pitch cues. The elder initiates an other-repair from the instructor/teacher in line 1. The elder begins in English, but cues up the Halkomelem phrase: *do you want it uh 'i'*? The instructor then models the target form of the task with lowered pitch in lines 2 and 4. The elder invites the learners back into the interaction with raised pitch in line 5.

In extract 4.8, the elder self-initiates a repair in Halkomelem in line 4 about where they are in the text, *aléts'e*, 'where'. When the teacher echoes this question, the elder self-repairs her procedural question in line 6, *sqwélqwel sexete isá:le*, 'words section two'. After an unclear turn from the teacher, the elder orients to her own previous turn as a reparable in line 8, *ewe?* The instructor then confirms and extends the procedural repair, *yeah, s'íwes letse*, 'yeah, lesson one'.

In extract 4.9, the elder again checks the procedure with the instructor, *e' stl'i kw'els kwixet?*, 'you want me to read?'. In line 3, a learner echoes this question in a whispered aside. In line 4, another learner then asks a (non-target) clarification question in target language, *kwixet? chexw?*, 'read? you?'. Both the learners and the elder used an S-I-O-R trajectory to repair procedural talk. This trajectory appears to function to repair

understanding about procedure between an elder and teacher, to practice output for a student, and to clarify what was happening next.

Both target language other-repair trajectories in extracts 4.8 and 4.9 involve clarification questions from the elder to the instructor. Although the instructor was responsible for arranging the procedure, it was the elder who was responsible for providing the authorized input to the instructor. As such, their separate responsibilities seem to have motivated this particular repair trajectory from elder to instructor in order to clarify procedure, and from teacher to elder in order to clarify target language forms.

In line 1 of extract 4.10, a learner uses an extended negotiation of procedure in English with S-I-O-R trajectory. She requests a controlled amount of target language input to get appropriate input to make best use of the potential rehearsal time for the wedding honouring speech. This student-initiated request serves to repair and successfully redirect the task procedure.

In extract 4.11, a learner begins an S-I-O-R move in line 1 but rejects two offered repairs in lines 3 and 5. In line 9, he counters with his own self-repair through two attempts until the elder offers the target form in line 10. He accepts this in line 11 with a whispered (echoed) target production.

Extract 4.12 illustrates the other-initiated repair. In lines 2 and 3, the elder and I both suggest *lhelikwes*, 'sometimes', as an answer to the question about how often the student does the laundry. The student's target language response, *lhelikwes*, 'sometimes', in whispered voice, suggests lexical uncertainty. When the elder treats it as an answer to the question, with *oh* in line 6, the student quickly self-repairs in English in line 7, with *all the time*.

With the exception of the non-target negotiation of procedure in 4.10, all the other data samples represent examples of organizational confusion. Data excerpts 4.7 to 4.9 and 4.11 involve participants working to decide where they are in a procedure or how to proceed. These procedural problems provide an opportunity to negotiate meaning in target language to some extent. All examples constituted actual problems facing participants in organizing their learning activities together.

4.3.5 Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in LI classes

My findings differ from those of Seedhouse (2004), who found little evidence of turn-taking in a procedural context and most procedural talk delivered in teacher

monologue, as discussed in Section 4.2.5. Procedural talk in the LI classes provided a relatively rich source of language input, as well as varied opportunities for target language practice. Although teachers occasionally gave brief directions, there were almost as many strategies as interactions. The following types of strategies were often co-constructed across turns by all participants: deciding what to do, directing, inviting, nominating, clarifying, negotiating, and repairing procedural work. All participants negotiated this work through a locally-managed and conversational style of interaction with much code-switching.

Procedural repair also provided an opportunity for participant-initiated negotiation and clarification of real world problems using target language in a genuinely communicative context. Although the more expert language *knowers* provided most of the target language, all participants initiated repairs in procedure and employed both languages strategically. Procedural repair provides one context where learners can hear and understand unfamiliar constructions in a meaningful context. This was apparent in extract 4.9 when the elder asked the teacher in Halkomelem in line 1 if she wanted her to read out the speech first. One student echoed the construction, a nominalized subordinate clause *e' stl'i kw'els kwixet?* (i.e., literally: 'your wishing is that I read it?'), while another student rephrased the clause in one word questions: *kwixet? chexw?* 'read it? you?'. The layers of repair successfully situated this nominalized clause in a communicative context of use. The specific repairs included repeating the construction to clarify what the elder was stating, or clarifying who wanted who to do what. The success of the clarification was evident to all when the elder subsequently read out the speech. Although I hypothesize that this complex clause was morphologically unanalyzed by learners, this repair may have provided an initial opportunity to understand the real world pragmatic force of the construction. With future use and practice, the learner may be able to recognize and segment the structural pattern of the nominalized clause construction. This use of language also has some aspects of the notion of *legitimate peripheral participation* of Lave and Wenger (1991).⁴⁰ In this classroom interaction, the learner is peripherally involved in producing Halkomelem within a communicative procedural context.

A contrast with this finding of some target language use, however, is seen in a comparison with a non-procedural task that will be discussed without an excerpted

⁴⁰ White (2004) also terms the use of clarification sequences as 'legitimate peripheral participation', or apprenticeship, in his study of a Haida immersion camp.

transcription. One subtask of the jigsaw activity was to discuss what one character should do if her partner did not help more with the housework. This subtask provoked some heated discussion in English. In more communicatively riveting activities, the learners had more difficulty navigating their discussion in target language. Procedural talk about how to organize the activity itself is less riveting, but is still relevant talk. Procedural talk provided a genuine but manageable topic for some target language negotiation. This finding supports a role for the real-life, but not emotionally-laden, business of organizing procedures in classrooms. In summary, procedural misunderstandings provided all participants some opportunity both to generate some target language input and to manage some meaningful interactions in Halkomelem.

4.4 Linguistics classes and procedural talk

The linguistics classes were run by an instructor who had worked for years with this group of learners. The teaching activities are described in Section 3.2.

4.4.1 Procedural language output: Analysis

In this section I summarize the procedural target language output in each of the example Linguistics classes. Table 4.7 presents the number of utterances of procedural talk in the target language in terms of structural complexity, by speaker. Speakers included the instructor (T), students (S), and elder (E).

Table 4.7: Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in Linguistics classes

Date	Speaker	name	e'e/ewe	<1 word	1 word	formulaic	phrase	clause 1 verb	clause >1 verb
Feb 11	T	4	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
	S	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Feb 18	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Overall, procedural talk in the Linguistics classes was sparse, efficient, and was primarily in non-target language. As seen in Table 4.7, the second class had no recorded

target language procedural talk and the first class had minimal procedural target language talk.

Figure 4.7: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus in Linguistics classes

<i>Instructor</i>		
1 word	chiyolh?	fire?
particle	éwe?	no?
name	(Name)	
<i>Students</i>		
particle	éwe	no
name	(Name)	
<i>Elder</i>		
1 word	chiyolh	fire

Figure 4.7 presents examples of the types of procedural talk in the first class. Target language production was in single words in an otherwise English matrix in the spelling-translation task. The instructor called on class participants, using their Halkomelem names, and one student used my (Halkomelem-ized) name. The interaction continued with a switch in focus into a meta-linguistic discussion about the presence of vowel length. Target language complexity, both heard and produced by learners in the context of procedural talk, is limited to formulaic uses: the names of participants and the response *éwe*, 'no'.

4.4.2 Interaction in Linguistics classes: Data examples and description

In this section I describe the procedural interaction in the first of two Linguistics classes and discuss why procedural talk might be so minimal. Procedural talk was used to prompt student production, to redirect student focus back on task, and to shift focus to linguistic elicitation on vowel length. In this teacher-controlled class, the instructor managed all activities with gentle humour while learners appeared attentive and on task.

4.4.2.1 Linguistics Class #1, (February 11): Description and examples

In extract 4.13, the instructor is cueing up the spelling review. He delivers the procedural directions as an invitation and instigates the task with a teacher prompt,

followed by a learner production. This is a familiar interactional format for a form-and-accuracy context focus (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 107) and is familiar to these students.

(4.13) 03 (Linguistics class): do you wanna start us off?

1. T Uh (Name), (cough) do you wanna start us off (.) with uh
some relaxing vocabulary practice before our quiz? (.)
chiyolh? (1) fire
2. S yeah, (.) fire?

The first part of the adjacency pair in turns 1 and 2 both invites participation and provides a teacher prompt. These acts are tightly connected in one turn by the instructor in line 1 and are doubly responded to by the student in line 2, (*yeah, fire?*). Line 1 functions to frame the subsequent interaction, not shown here, in which the teacher nominates students serially to produce specific language forms. These forms are direct translations of a word list. The instructor's conversational opening quickly and efficiently shifts the interaction to a focus on a form-and-accuracy task. The student's quick response of the elicited word helps to create this focus. Instructor and students cooperate to produce a tightly controlled turn-taking situation with clear focus on producing isolated alphabet letters and translated words.

The extract in 4.14 shows the instructor re-focusing attention to the ongoing task by picking up the turn-taking routine. Prior to this excerpt, the students had been providing the missing spelling letters to projected words from the computer when the elder entered the room. People got up to make room and recognize her arrival, which the elder jokingly commented about with *people stand up when we come*.

(4.14) Feb 11, '03 (Linguistics class): where were we?

1. T ah where were we? was it uh (Name) I think
it's you right
2. S1 *éwe*. no
3. T: *éwe?* no?
4. S1 I think it's (name) ((laughter))

5. T we're doing ah firewood here
6. Ss ((laughter))
7. S2 I already went
8. S1 ((laughter)) *siyolh* Y-O ((laughter)) firewood
 ((classroom task resumes))

After the instructor designates a respondent in line 1, the designated person demurs in line 2 using the negative particle *éwe*, 'no' and re-designates another person, who also demurs in line 7. The negotiation extends from lines 1 to 8, when the first student resumes the task.

In extract 4.15, the instructor redirects the pedagogical focus. The procedure shifts from eliciting translations and spelling letters to a meta-linguistic discussion of vowel length.

(4.15) February 11, '03 (Linguistics class): I just wanna try and listen

1. T before before- that's right it's YO- before I put it in there
I'd like to
2. S1 (xx *susal*) (x)Susan
3. T to listen to um (Name) say it. I just wanna try and listen
and see if there is length there.
4. S3 (xx) T too
5. S4 *eve* no
6. T (Name), (2) could you please say for us the word for (.)
firewood, *siyolh*. firewood
7. E *siyolh* (1) firewood
8. SS *siyolh* firewood
9. T that doesn't sound very long to me:

10. S3 (x) *ewe* no
11. T does that sound long to you *susal* it doesn't sound long at all (.) but now what we don't know is u:h I mean I'm pretty sure that it's short, but what we don't know is it dialect variation, or just speaker variation, or um ↓what's going on here. but certainly that didn't sound very long to me.

There is only minimal target language throughout this shift in focus. This includes the single lexical item being discussed (*siyolh* 'firewood'), and typically, the use of *ewe*, 'no' and the name of the elder.

In the subsequent translation task provided in excerpt 4.16, the instructor used only a student's Halkomelem name. However, he also provided the CD ROM 'voice' as the cue for the student translation.

(4.16) February 11, (Linguistics): you tell me

1. T how bout you tell me some stuff. how about (Name)
you tell me what this means
2. CD *lets'áxw kw'es-elh olu (tl'ep?) te máqe*
one-time that-past very thick the snow
'once upon a time the snow was deep'
3. S once upon a time the snow was deep
4. T right. once upon a time the snow was deep. thank you.

In this activity, the instructor brings another voice into the interaction: the recorded voice of the elder, in line 2. This voice does not interact with the learners. Instead, the voice provides the sanctioned target form of the language as an object of study and analysis.

4.4.3 Turn-taking in procedural talk in Linguistics classes

Table 4.8 summarizes procedural talk in the Linguistics classes. The categories used are as described in Section 4.2.3

Table 4.8: Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in Linguistics classes

Data set	Class	Social acts	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
4.13 <i>do you wanna start us off</i>	Ling Feb 11	Prompt speech production	Teacher-controls	Adjacency pair: invite- accept	Pre-determined	L1+L2-L1
4.14 <i>where were we?</i>	Ling Feb 11	Redirect attention	Teacher controls	Clarification question & answer and monologue	Pre-determined	L1 (+ code switching)
4.15 <i>I just wanna listen</i>	Ling Feb 11	Shift focus	Teacher controls	Elicitation request and comment	Locally-managed	L1 (+ code switching)
4.16 <i>you tell me</i>	Ling Feb 11	Direct procedure	Teacher controls with CD	Task direction	Pre-determined	L1-L2-L1

In extract 4.13, the teacher establishes the interactional dynamic in one conversational move (in line 1), pre-determining the turn-taking and the content of the next TCU. The first part of the adjacency pair does an invitation in English, *uh (name), do you wanna start us off (.) with some relaxing vocabulary practice before our quiz?* This first part is linked to the first part of a teacher prompt adjacency pair, *chiyolh?* (also in line 1) with a brief (unmeasured) pause. The student orients to the utterance as having two first parts of two adjacency pairs in the next turn by accepting the invitation and by providing the English translation, *yeah, (.) fire?*

In extract 4.14, the teacher re-establishes the pre-determined turn-taking procedure in line 1 after the elder's entrance and clarifies whose turn it is. In extract 4.15, the instructor defers the current turn-taking procedure and pedagogical focus to a meta-linguistic focus in lines 1 and 3. Although the student's previous response was *right*, the instructor wants to *try and listen and see if there is (vowel) length there*. The teacher controls the allocation of turns, the pedagogical focus, and the content of the turns.

In extract 4.16, the instructor cues up the task again, this time using the elder's voice on the CD ROM as the trigger in line 2. The following speaker, selected by the previous speaker (i.e. the instructor), orients to the previous turn of line 1, rather than to the CD 'turn', by providing the translation.

Overall, the interaction style in the Linguistics class is teacher-fronted, with very tight control of topic and turn-taking and with pre-determined content of learner TCUs. Unlike previous classes, procedural talk is minimal.

4.4.4 Repair in procedural talk in Linguistics classes

In the following section, I describe how procedural talk is repaired in the Linguistics class. Table 4.9 summarizes the repair characteristics.

Table 4.9: Repair characteristics of procedural talk in Linguistics class.

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
4.14 <i>where were we?</i>	Feb 11, '03	S-I-O-R	Learners negotiate turns	L1 + L2 particles/names
4.15 <i>I just wanna try and listen</i>	Feb 11, '03	S-I-S-R	Teacher redirects procedure	L1 with code switching

Extract 4.14 illustrates a repairable in the turn-taking procedure. A learner uses the target language negative *éwe* in line 2 to negotiate the next turn-taker. Although the turn-taking is teacher-controlled, it is locally-managed. Participants occasionally forget whose turn it is or negotiate the turn-taking pattern.

In extract 4.15, the instructor does a self-repair of his allocated procedure in lines 1 and 3. The repair switches focus from translating single words to a meta-repair (see section 4.2.4), specifically inviting feedback on perceived vowel length. The repair trajectory ends in line 11 with no clear repair beyond identifying a need to know *what's going on here*.

4.4.5 Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in Linguistics classes

Participants' use of target language procedural talk in the Linguistics class did not extend beyond the use of a few particles and the use of traditional Halkomelem names. Several factors seem to have caused this pattern. The teacher and learners are very familiar with each other and with class tasks. The format of the tasks and language

content are discussed more extensively in the context of doing a justification, discussed in Chapter 5. The target language proficiency of the class is limited. In this class, target language is completely task-oriented and is focused on single word translations or their spelling. With the aforementioned exceptions, this limited amount of procedural talk happens in English.

This limited target language output (*e'e*, *e'we*, and traditional names) may also have been due to another factor. I suggested earlier that interactional choices vary according to particular goals, such as improving literacy skills, meeting ceremonial community needs, marking shared affiliation with others, displaying commitment to the language and culture, and sharing personal experiences. Although these available target language tokens do not go far to realize some goals, they do help to display commitment to the language and culture. They serve as linguistic badges of affiliation. The interactional moments of turn-taking and doing repairs provide a limited context for using *e'e*, *e'we*, and traditional names, and participants are heard to use them whenever possible.

An obvious difference between the Linguistics classes and the review and immersion classes is the smooth and practiced execution of procedure in this context. Procedural talk was compressed in extract 4.13, and brief and conversational in extract 4.14. Classroom procedure seemed familiar to all participants and required little ongoing management.

4.5 Mentoring session and procedural talk

During the mentoring session, both the first and last activity involved some negotiation of procedure using the target language. Both participants also discussed the mentoring process in general in English. Overall, both participants managed this session as an opportunity for the learner to interact with the native speaker to increase the learner's fluency in the language, using both languages strategically.

4.5.1 Procedural language output: Analysis

Table 4.10 summarizes the target language output in the mentoring session, organized by complexity. Though not all of her contributions were totally target-like, the student's procedural talk output was parallel to the elder's output in structural complexity in the mentoring session.

Table 4.7: Total tokens of target language utterance types in procedural talk in mentoring

Speaker	Name	e'e/ewe	1 word	phrase	1 verb	clause 1 verb	clause >1 verb
elder	1	10	2	1	3	5	-
student	1	4	3	1	3	2	1

Tokens of target language types produced by both participants in the mentoring session are represented in Figure 4.8.

Figure 4.4: Types of target language utterances in procedural focus in mentoring

<i>Elder</i>		
particle	e'e	yes
word (noun)	sts'iye?	dessert
name (language)	Halkomelem	Halkomelem
clause 1 verb (incomplete)	o:: ts'áts'el qex te	o there are lots of
clause 1 verb (attributive)	te ixw lheq'elexw	that you know
word (transitive verb)	miset	choose it
clause > 1 verb (adjective predicate)	qex te lheq'elexw	I know lots
	xwelá te cheam	about Cheam
clause 1 verb (possessor question)	tewat.s shxwoxwiyam	whose story
<i>Learner</i>		
particle	e'e	yes
phrase (Verb+Object)	maythox?	help me
name (language)	Halkomelem	Halkomelem
clause 1 verb (question)	stam te	what (ones)
word (transitive verb)	lheqelexw	to know something
word (complex?)	xwcheam	about Cheam
clause > 1 verb (existence + attributive clause)	te í skwoxam skoxam	there are lots of stories
	te qeylt te cheam	written about Cheam
clause 1 verb (possessor question)	tewat te í te' (story)	whose story is it (non-target-like)

The range and complexity of target language in these data are noteworthy, varying from single words to clausal constructions. The elder produced and the learner concomitantly heard a wide range of constructions: a plain transitive verb, adjectival predicates, an adjectival predicate with morphologically complex phrasal and clausal attributives, an incomplete attributive clause, an existence clause, and a possessive predicate question. The learner also attempted as well as produced a variety of clausal constructions: a plain transitive verb, an existence clause, a transitive verb with object person marking, and a transitive verb with non-control transitive marking but without person marking. She produced non-target forms at first in a possessive question

predicate and a complex clause asking for a translation. These Halkomelem constructions were all in the relatively limited context of procedural talk in the mentoring session.

4.5.2 Interaction in mentoring: Data examples and description

In this section, I describe (a) the language output as it is situated within the interactional patterns of procedural talk in the mentoring session, and (b) the work that this talk accomplished. Procedural talk was used to elicit a translation, negotiate story choice, background a story, and manage task foci. The student primarily directed the interaction while the elder scaffolded her production. There is no evidence of teacher-directed procedural talk in the form of monologues in the mentoring session. The elder did deliver a monologue, but it was in another context, namely in telling a story that she has privileged access to.

The interaction in extract 4.17 happens at the very beginning of taping the mentoring session. The learner is preparing to demonstrate a recipe task and asks the elder for help in asking for a translation.

(4.17) May 21, '05 (Mentoring): a word for "translate"?

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. | S | <i>maythox?</i> | help me? |
| 2. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 3. | S | <i>maythox um (3.4) st'iye</i> | help me um (dessert) |
| 4. | E | <i>sts'iye?</i> | dessert? |
| 5. | S | <i>sts'iye. dessert. ((laughter))</i> | dessert |
| 6. | E | <i>oh e'e</i> | oh yes |
| 7. | S | <i>maythox (.) translate,
um (kw'e til ke' thoyx)
um (?) translate or</i> | help me
(that you help me) |
| 8. | E | <i>um</i> | |
| 9. | S | <i>is there?=
</i> | |

7. S I'll let- I'll let he:r pick (2)
8. E ((laughter)) (4) o:: ts'áts'el qex te (1.2) very many
9. S [((laughter))
10. E [shxwoxwiyam (.5) oh my. (1.5) hm (3) stories
o:::: my:::: (1.5) hm (2.1) um::my (5.4)

((21 turns of demurring))

In extract 4.18, the learner agrees to ask the elder questions about a story, but when I ask for *lets'e shxwoxwiyam*, 'one story', in line 6, protocol and procedure combine in a lengthy negotiation. In line 7, the student defers to the elder in choosing a story to talk about. In line 8, the elder begins doing a demur, extensively mitigated in lines 8-10 with laughter, pauses, a disclaimer, *ts'áts'el qex te shxwoxwiyam*, 'there are so many stories', and five successive TCUs of demurs in line 10. The learner finally nominates a story, 21 turns of demurs and counter-demurs after this excerpt.

In extract 4.19, the query about which stories the elder knows is co-constructed with the elder's help. The clausal form of the query is distributed or scaffolded across three turns in lines 1-3. After confirming the structure of the question, the learner then code-switches, with laughter, to ask the elder to pick one, in line 5. I provide a blended Halkomelem-English translation in line 7, *pick chexw!* The elder treats this in line 10 as a call for an appropriate translation, which she gives with *miset* 'pick it'.

(4.19) May 21, '05 (Mentoring): you pick

1. S it was going through my hea:d (.4) kno::wledge?
what do you know: (.3) *stam te::* what is the
2. E *te ixw* (.5) *lheq'élexw* that you know
3. S *lheq'élexw* know
4. E *e'e* (.6) yes
5. S *e'e* which one (1.9) you pick ((LAUGHTER)) yes
oh ey oh good

6.	E	[e'e	yes
7.	SR	[pick <i>chexw</i>	'pick' you
8.	E	e'e	yes
9.	S	((LAUGHTER))	
10.	E	<i>miset</i>	choose
11.	SR	↑ <i>miset oh [e'e!</i>	choose oh yes
12.	E	[e'e	yes
13.	E	((laughter))	
14.	SR	<i>miset</i>	choose

The initial procedural repair work functions to defer to the respected status of the elder to determine personal stories for sharing. In addition, the elder's very extended repair of the procedural repair functions to turn the choice back to the learner. The learner's attempt to ask the elder to choose takes much less work (in line 1) than the elder's work to let the learner take over, which the latter subsequently does in extract 4.20.

In extract 4.20, the learner nominates a potential story, the elder confirms her roots in Cheam territory, and then the elder begins a telling of the origins of the mountains in Cheam territory. Specifically, the learner nominates a story in turn 1, using a complex clausal construction *te í skwoxam te xeylt te cheam*, 'there is a story written about Cheam'. After the participants confirm Cheam as a topic in turns 2 and 3, the elder uses clausal utterances to accomplish four acts: she observes that there are lots of such stories (in turn 4); she stresses, with no elaboration, the form of a target language affix (in turn 4, line 2); she situates her knowledge of the stories in her family history (in line 6); and, finally, she starts the story (in line 8). In line 8, the target language is abandoned for English, with the exception of the names of the salient characters. These names are the main point of the story.

After excerpt 4.20, the elder provides a lengthy justification of the story and its cultural and spiritual relevance. After that justification (which is not provided as a transcript) the learner and I make a final procedural request in extract 4.21.

(4.21) May 21, '05 (Mentoring): Whose story is it?

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1. | S | okay, (1) so we could practise? (.4) | |
| 2. | E | <i>e'e</i> (2.2) | yes |
| 3. | S | <i>tewat te í te' shxwoxwiyam</i> (.9) | (whose story is it) |
| 4. | E | <i>tewat.s shxwoxwiyam?</i>
<i>e'e, tl'o swa s thel shxwemliqwelh</i> (.5) | it is whose story?
yes, it's my own story |

The elder agrees in turn 2 to a procedural request. The following unfilled pause of 2.2 seconds frames the switch in focus to the learning activity and the form of the learner's question in turn 3. The elder then repairs the not-quite-target question with a recast, reforming the target construction as a confirmation question in turn 4. She then immediately answers the question in her next TCU in turn 4, line 2, switching the focus again from a focus on the form to a focus on meaning.

4.5.3 Turn-taking in procedural context in the mentoring session

Table 4.11 summarizes turn-taking characteristics in procedural talk in the mentoring session, using the categories explained in Section 4.2.3. Turn-taking was almost entirely locally-managed by the student and elder working together in a coordinated effort to understand each other and to manage the flow of the tasks they had chosen for the mentoring demonstration session.

Table 4.11: Turn-taking characteristics of procedural talk in Mentoring

Data set	Class	Social acts	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
4.17 <i>a word for translate?</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	Elicit translation	Student controls	Adjacency pairs: request-help	Locally-managed	L2- L1-L2
4.18 <i>oh there are so many stories</i>	Mentoring May 21	Direct task	Student controls	Adjacency pair: defer -demur	Locally-managed	L1- L2-L1
4.19 <i>you pick</i>	Mentoring May 21	Choose story	Student controls	Invite-repair invite	Locally-managed	L1-L2
4.20 <i>there is a story about Cheam</i>	Mentoring May 21	Background story	Student controls	Nominate topic-accept & justify	Locally-managed	L2
4.21 <i>whose story is it?</i>	Mentoring May 21	Redirect task focus	Student controls	Propose & do question- answer sequence	Partly pre-determined	L1-L2

Extract 4.17 illustrates locally directed and jointly managed turn-taking as the learner asks for help in line 1. She elicits a translation in line 4 as she plans how to report the baking task. In extract 4.18, the learner also controls the procedure in line 7. She mediates an extensive interaction as she demurs to the elder in the choice of the story (through three excerpts 4.18- 4.20), as well as through 21 additional turns of demurring.

In extract 4.19, the learner provides an initial fill-in-the-blank or *syntactic bait* to elicit help from the elder, in line 1. The learner's lengthened final vowel in line 1 also highlights and cues the form of the next TCU. In line 2, the elder then scaffolds the appropriate construction for asking a question about which stories she knows. The learner's focus in line 3 appears to be on the lexical item *lheq'élexw* 'know' rather than the whole construction. Throughout this interaction both interactants manage the talk strategically with pauses and laughter to focus on the lexical form of the verbs *lheq'élex* 'know', and *míset* 'pick'. This joint and mirrored timing shows something of the responsive, moment-by-moment work done in ordinary conversation to coordinate everyday activities, whether in a classroom or other context.

Extract 4.20 illustrates participants finally managing to negotiate that the elder will tell a story and which one. In line 6, the elder situates her knowledge of the story in her ancestral history. All the procedural challenges both participants work on in this task support extended target language use until the actual telling begins in turn 8 of excerpt 4.20. A final procedural focus in extract 4.21 is managed locally, within an assigned task with specific questions (in line 3) and with target language repair (in line 4).

4.5.4 Repair in procedural context in a mentoring session

The following section describes how procedural talk is repaired in the mentoring session. Table 4.12 summarizes the examples of repairs.

Table 4.12: Repair of procedural talk in mentoring

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
4.17 <i>a word for translate?</i>	Mentoring May 21	S-I O-R (incomplete)	Translation request	L2 (verb, single words, subordinate clause)
4.18 <i>oh there are so many stories</i>	Mentoring May 21	O-I O-R	Student defers Elder demurs	L1-L2 (L2 clause)
4.19 <i>you pick</i>	Mentoring May 21	S-I O-R & O-I O-R	Repair/co-construct doing an invitation	L1-L2 (L2 clause, Verb)
4.20 <i>there is a story about Cheam</i>	Mentoring May 21	O-I O-R	Focus on form (xw-place)	L2 (clauses, words, phrase, e'e)
4.21 <i>whose story is it?</i>	Mentoring May 21	O-I O-R	Recast as confirmation question	L1-L2 (L2 clause)

In extract 4.17 lines 1 to 7, the student uses an extended self-initiated other-repair trajectory in a request for translation help. When the attempted repair flounders, the learner strategically redirects the repair in her L1 in line 11: *is there a word for translate*. However, the response in line 12 is also in English, as the elder ponders how to translate an untranslatable word.

In extract 4.18, I propose a new task in line 1, using my L1 (English), followed by a target language request for a story in line 6. The learner repairs this proposed procedure with an other-initiated other-repair, mitigated by self-repair in line 7, *I'll let- I'll let he:r pick*, and by laughter from the elder. In a switch to clausal target language, the elder begins doing a demur in lines 8 and 10, *o:: ts'áts'el qex te shxwoxwiyam*, 'oh, there are so many stories'.

Extract 4.19 involves an intertwining repair of form and meaning, or lexical choice and procedural-cum-protocol choice. In both cases of lexical repair (of *lheq'élexw* in lines 1 to 5 and *míset* in lines 5 to 14), the elder other-repairs. The right to repair the form and the right to decide which story is told both belong to the elder.

In extract 4.20, the elder does a repair in line 4 as a recast of the student's utterance in line 1. First the elder confirms the topic of Cheam in line 2. Then the elder demurs that there are many stories about Cheam in line 4, and clarifies that her ancestors come from Cheam, in line 6. She uses a collocation *xwelám te cheam* in line 4, and then self-repairs that in the same turn with a morphologically complex *xw-cheam* (*xw*, 'pertaining to place'). The student echoes the recast form in line 5, and the elder continues with the story and justification in lines 6 and 8. The whole interaction, which is focused on both form and meaning, is in the target language.

In extract 4.21, the elder also echoes the not quite target-like question with a recast (line 4). She then answers it (also in line 4).

4.5.5 Discussion: Interaction and procedural talk in a mentoring session

The interactional work varied widely in mentoring. Participants co-constructed the following types of acts in locally-managed interaction: asking for help, doing repair, focusing on form within the procedural negotiations, choosing a story, and doing lengthy defers and demurs.

Doing negotiation and repair of procedure supported numerous opportunities for target language input and production by the student. This work also produced some of the most complex language collected in the data. Authentic contexts for genuine target language interaction were created by the locally-managed nature of the turn-taking, by its real-life focus on a procedural decision (deciding which story to tell), and by the careful interpersonal negotiations of sharing topic-control.

Both participants were equally involved in initiating repair in this data. However, in all cases the elder provided the repair. A further observation related to a trigger place for target language use. When speakers used target language at a TRP to complete a procedural repair, it was also responded to in target language in the next turn.

Although the recipe production task (following excerpt 4.17) was mostly in Halkomelem and the follow-up questions about the story used Halkomelem extensively (excerpt 4.21), the tasks themselves were not always produced in target language. For example, the recipe-writing task involved simultaneously translating into English, and a discussion about mentoring was in English (not presented in these data). The story-telling task imparted critical cultural and spiritual information and was delivered in English, with the exception of the highlighted traditional names but was facilitated by pre-telling procedural talk in target language. The final task of follow-up questions was introduced in English in line 3 of extract 4.21. However, the extensive following task (not provided) was almost entirely in the target language, with over four pages of transcription.

Overall, target language interaction focused on establishing mutual understanding about the procedure and the story, and therefore was genuinely communicative. The target language interaction also supported a focus on the form of some constructions.

4.6 Summary and conclusion: Turn-taking and repair in procedural context

In contrast to Seedhouse's (2004) findings that procedural talk involved little interaction and was largely teacher-dominated, my findings suggest that procedural talk was a resource for some genuine communicative interaction in Halkomelem. Noticing procedural problems and working out solutions are real-world activities and fundamental to actions in a classroom-learning context. If people have come together with an agreement to undertake language-learning tasks, then understanding and agreeing exactly how they will do it is the first and frequent order of business. As such, a focus on procedure provides an actual problem, rather than an assigned problem.

An analysis of turn-taking and repair over extended contributions in the context of a focus on procedure shows how all participants in these classes clarify and negotiate procedures, scaffold each others' understandings, and report on procedure itself.

Although much of the work in these classes happens in the L1, the learners do use varying amounts of target language to manage procedural talk. This finding positions procedural talk as a learning resource in itself.

Turn-taking and repair patterns vary across the procedural contexts in these classes. Repair trajectories exemplify various strategies, but the most common patterns were self-initiated other-repairs and other-initiated other-repairs. Two interesting examples are (i) other-initiated multiple-other repair, a variation on a pattern of teacher-initiated peer-repair that was noted by Seedhouse in his data; and (ii) a unique trajectory of other-repair-plus-elder confirmation. The critical role of other-repair in this context suggests that, even in procedural talk, although learners may instigate repair, they rely on others to implement and authorize repair.

These repair types follow from the general observation that target language use is also severely constrained. The typical goal of language teaching, that the teacher teaches the L2, is somewhat compromised in this situation. As pointed out earlier, the non-native speaker instructors have proposed tasks that are supervised and scaffolded by the present elder. Productive capacity in the target language by everyone except the elder is severely limited, resulting in extensive negotiation in the L1. Target language modelling requires production or affirmation by the elder. Consequently, a fluidity of roles with shifting responsibilities is reflected in a concomitant unique repair trajectory, realized as other-initiated-plus-elder-confirmed other-repair. This sequence is worked out on a turn-by-turn basis in response to the practical, linguistic, and cognitive constraints of all participants.

The interactional organization for bringing about this repair and turn-taking has many parallels with the principles of ordinary conversation as elucidated by Sacks et al. (1974). Interactants orient to each other's turns, making their turns at talk conditionally relevant. Participants repair failures in understanding. Together, turn-taking and repair establish a provisional state of intersubjectivity about what participants are doing and what constitutes their shared world, and, in this context, the target language. Participants orient normatively to a desire for affiliation, especially given their shared overall aim to learn and revitalize an endangered language.

A difference from ordinary conversation in this context is that repair uses an other-repair trajectory more often than ordinary conversation, as well as a unique trajectory of other-initiated and elder-confirmed other-repair. I suggest this structure

reflects various unequal rights to authoritative knowledge about the language and access to that knowledge.

This analysis shows procedural talk falling along a continuum of interactional organization, rather than being a separate institutional variety of talk with separate institutional practices. Procedural talk also reflects a variety of interactional patterns. Although procedural repair follows an other-repair trajectory that is more typical of L2 classroom discourse, participants also use a unique jointly scaffolded repair trajectory. Meanwhile turn-taking often reflects a more conversational model in this context of shifting roles and less certain claims to ownership of knowledge.

The classes also indicate a range of language complexity output in procedural talk, from minimal in the Linguistics class where procedure required little review or negotiation, to more complex in less familiar tasks, to the most complex in the mentoring session. In these data, when learners had ample and varied opportunities for modelled input, contextualized practice developing topics relating to their own lives, and sufficient practice with other learners or a supportive speaker, they produced a variety of complex kinds of target language constructions. Some of this output was not conversational, but was enabled by prior quasi-conversational interactive tasks. These tasks also included opportunities to do limited repair of procedural problems in target language, most often instigated by the elder and instructor.

Procedural talk seems to provide in most classes at least one genuine communicative task, as described by Skehan (1998). Solving procedural problems requires meaningful communicative interaction that is conversation-like. Not only is procedural talk closest to everyday conversation in its interaction, but talking about procedure may be exploited by learners and teachers alike to maximize appropriate opportunities for target language input and extended learner target language practice.

CHAPTER 5: DOING A JUSTIFICATION

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 4 I analyzed the relation of interaction and target language in a context of setting up procedure for various learning activities. In this chapter I analyze the relation between interaction and target language produced in a sub-variety of procedural talk: doing a justification of the procedure. The data are again drawn from the nine classes as shown in Table 3.1. Similarly, for each class type I first categorize types of target language utterances by learners and native speakers or instructors as simple to complex structures. I provide data sets from each class to describe how pedagogical focus on doing a justification is reflected in its interactional organization, and then specifically look at turn-taking and repair. Finally I discuss how certain interactional choices both enable and constrain different types of language production in the context of procedural talk.

I find more similarities to Seedhouse's model of procedural talk in this chapter than in the last chapter. More talk is in English, rather than the target language. Doing a justification is delivered more often through teacher monologue. However, I also find that language choice is sensitive to a cline of pragmatic urgency and that interactional patterns are reflected in a variety of ways.

5.2 Language Review (LR) classes and doing a justification

In the baseline LR class of September 22, one student does a meta-justification of the whole process of learning the language. Using target language, she constructs an extended repair with the elder to prepare and articulate a speech about herself and her dream to teach the language. In the second class, one student briefly justifies *not* doing the assigned activity, using no target language.

5.2.1 Language output doing a justification in LR classes

The activities in the LR classes share some attributes of what is termed *task* in the task-based-learning (TBL) field (Prabhu, 1987; Nunan, 1988) and as described within a

communicative teaching approach in Section 2.4.2. The teacher allocates the learners a task “and then generally withdraws” (Seedhouse 2004, p. 120). Seedhouse (2004, pp. 125-127, 129) notes that a potential drawback of TBL is that it produces minimalized, reduced target language, and that “students can go off-task, including speaking in the L1”. The Halkomelem data, however, exemplify two extremes: a task which supports production of a complex language construction, and a task which produces almost no target language at all, at least in the context of doing a justification.

In the realization of the first task, *or task in process*⁴¹, the learner does a meta-justification of the whole learning process. In an extended repair, this learner and the elder speaker focus on an emerging construction while resolving a pragmatic misunderstanding.

Table 5.1 describes the types of total target language output in the LR classes that focus on doing a justification. The speakers include the elder, the students and me (SR).

Table 5.1: Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification in LR classes. Note: Because the elder was reading out student work, the asterisks (*) indicate that some clauses were non-target-like.

Date	Speaker	name	e'e	<1word	1word	Formula-ic	Specific construction	Complex clause/>1Verb
Sept 22	elder	2	28	3	10	2	5	7*
	student	2	4	6	9	-	7	6*
	SR	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Nov 10	instructor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	student	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nov 17	any speaker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

The student’s target output of more than one word in the first class focused on the specific construction *el stl'i kw'els* (Verb), ‘I want to (Verb)’, as isolated in Table 5.1. The learner uses the construction as a frame in which to vary one slot, specifically, the verb complement of *I want to*, which she expands with a variety of complex complements. Although not quite target-like these complements (a) detail the learner’s

⁴¹ As described in Section 2.4.1, Seedhouse (2004, p. 119) terms an intended pedagogical focus a *task-as-workplan*.

goal to become a language teacher, (b) clarify who she wants to teach and (c) justify why she is learning the language; specifically, to become proficient enough to teach the children of her First Nation. The selected interaction illustrates the emergence of this construction. The target language utterance frame and her utterances are presented in Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1: Emergence of a construction in LR class, September 22.

<p>Target language construction: el stl'i kw'els (verb)</p> <p>el stl'i kw'els iweséleq (xwela) te Halkomelem I want to be a Halkomelem teacher</p> <p>el stl'i kw'els iwest I want to teach (it)</p> <p>el stl'i kw'els iwest te sto:lo te stexwiwelh te Halkomelem sqweltel I want to teach the (First Nation) children the Halkomelem language</p> <p>el stl'i kw'els tolt Halkomelem (te) mayt me eylexw I want to teach the Halkomelem language (to) help get better</p>
--

The form of the construction is based on a pattern widely used across Salish. This construction includes a group of predicates that select for a nominalized clause complement (Kroeber, 1999; Davis, 2005)⁴². A proposed interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme gloss in the current orthography is shown below.

el	stl'i	kw'els	tol
e-l	s-tl'i	kw'-el	s-tol-t
aux.-1p	nom.-want	det.-my	nom.-learn-tr.
"I want to learn it" (my learning it is my wanting)			

The learner is using it to construct a series of potentially recursively embedded purpose clauses, as in: "I want to verb (in order) to verb (in order) to verb", a pattern that works in English. She had initially attempted the construction for *I want to teach* and *I want to teach (my First Nation's) children* in excerpts 5.1 and 5.2. However, as seen in

⁴² Davis (2005, p. 3) describes these nominalized subordinate clauses as "generally introduced by a reflex of the Proto-Salish nominalizer *s=, which is itself often (but by no means always) preceded by whichever determiner/ complementizer the language employs to introduce nonfactive subordinate clauses."

extract 5.6, the elder indicates problems with the embedded purpose clauses in Halkomelem and during an extended negotiation of pragmatic and lexical-morphological issues across nine excerpts, its construction and meaning are re-negotiated.

5.2.2 Interaction in LR: data examples and description by class

In this section I give data samples of the types of interaction in doing a justification in the Language Review classes. All data sets represent locally-managed talk within the constraints of an assigned task.

The data illustrate how a focus on form can also involve a shared focus on meaning (Seedhouse, 1997) as the task moves between three foci: doing the justification, focusing on form, and focusing on pragmatics. The interaction is locally-managed within two constraints: (i) the constraints of the assigned task within which the learner tries to do a meta-justification, and (ii) the constraints of an emerging construction to do the justification. Interaction doing a justification in the second class (described in Section 5.2.2.2) was also locally-managed, but involved no target language.

5.2.2.1 LR Class #1, (September 22): Description and examples

The development of the construction *el stl'i kw'els* (*Verb*) to do a justification follows lengthy negotiation spread over several data sets. In extract 5.1 the learner is presenting the elder with her proposed speech for editing. The lack of intersubjectivity is apparent.

(5.1) September 22, (LR): to want or to love, what's the diff?

- | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. S | <i>el stl'i te iwesteleq</i>
<i>te halq' te,</i>
would I say? | I want (teacher)
the halq'- (to) |
|------|---|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 6. | S | is it- is it <i>el</i> (.)
<i>el stl'i kw'els iwest</i>
(2) <i>te</i> (.) <i>te</i> (.)
<i>te sto:lo? te ste-(wixwelh sto:lo</i>

<i>te halkomelem sqweltel?</i>
(x) | I
I want to teach
the the
the river the
river chil- children
the Halkomelem language? |
| 7. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 8. | S | <i>e'e?</i> | yes? |
| 9. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 10. | S | mhm (8) | |

In extract 5.2, line 1, the elder provides an appropriate verb complement *iwels*, 'to teach'. She also initiates a focus on form when she starts to clarify the pronoun referent of the structure (-*el*-, 1p), with *that's what's you::r*. However, the student greets this attempt with some alarm or confusion about the focus at line 2 with *what!* This confusion continues through another adjacency pair sequence in lines 3-4. The elder and learner display a lack of consensus about what they are focusing on with *what's this again?* and *that's Halkomelem*. The elder accepts this response, indicating that new information has been accepted, with *oh* in line 5. Then the learner takes over control of the topic and activity in line 6 by asking for feedback on her justification, expressed now with a complete TCU, in target language. Using her written text, she produces the construction (*el stl'i kw'els*), the transitive suffix and an extended target-like complement (*iwest te halkomelem sqweltel*, 'teach the Halkomelem language') to elaborate her goal in teaching the language. This utterance is approved by the elder in line 7 and intersubjectivity is affirmed in a series of affirmation tokens in lines 7 to 10.

In extract 5.3 the elder is reading out the learner's prepared text. The elder begins a series of suggested repairs.

The elder suggests repairs in lines 1, 5, 7 and 9. The learner echoes two repairs in lines 2 and 8 and anticipates two of the repairs in lines 4 and 10. In lines 9 and 11 the elder confirms the learner's target form *s'oliye* 'dream'. However the elder provides a confirmation with question intonation to further repair the learner's offering in line 4. The learner's final anticipated repair suggests a scaffolding of this lexical item. Bygate (1988, p. 70) terms this type of utterance in line 12 a structural manipulation or *framing or completion* of any dependent satellite unit, whereby one speaker starts some part of a syntactic unit that is completed by another speaker in the next turn. I have termed this *taking the syntactic bait* (in Section 4.2.2.1).

Overall, the elder and learner accept the goal of the target utterance, to thank the elders for their help in realizing the learner's dream. Within this they focus on the form of single morphemes of the construction, as seen by the learner's sotto voce repetitions of the repairs, and also her proactive self-repair, in lines 4 and 10.

In extract 5.4 the elder reads out the next section of text with several pauses in line 1. These pauses suggest a number of possible repairables. She focuses on the meta-goal of the text, again offering a suggested clarification.

(5.4) September 22, (LR): to bring it back to life, right?

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|------------------------------|
| 1. | E | have <i>stl'el tl'ils</i> (1) <i>kw'els</i> (.7) <i>iwest</i> (2) | I (want/love)
to teach it |
| | | ah no what (1.1) this is a desire to lea:rn
(.5) <i>halkomelem</i> to help bring it
back to life right? (.3) | |
| 2. | S | mhm | |
| 3. | E | mkay (.7) um:: let me see, <i>tsel</i> (1.5) | I |

The construction in line 1 is non-target. However, the elder focuses on its intended message, which is to justify this and everyone's work to revive the language. The elder begins a lexical choice repair in line 3.

Like extract 5.1 and 5.4, extract 5.5 fluctuates between a focus on meaning and a focus on the form of the construction.

Extract 5.6 illustrates a pragmatic repair. It also shifts to more L1 use.

(5.6) September 22, (LR): You can't teach a language until you learn it

- | | | |
|------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. E | [because <i>iwest</i> , (.) <i>iwest</i> is | (because) teach, teach (is) |
| 2. S | [<i>stl'i kw'els tólt iwest</i> | I want to learn (to) teach |
| 3. E | <i>iwest</i> is when your going to teach | teach ... |
| 4. S | <i>°tolt</i> | learn it |
| 5. E | language to somebody else? | |
| | <i>e'e?</i> after you learn | yes? (after you learn) |

In line 1 the elder is focusing on a lexical item, *iwest* means 'to teach'. When the learner tries to use it in line 2 as an embedded complement, 'I want to learn to teach', the elder does not repair its non-target construction but first orients again to the lexical choice *iwest*. When the learner continues to try to insert *tolt* 'learn it', the elder indicates a pragmatic flaw: you cannot teach without learning the language first. The elder's lexical choice is clarified through a pragmatic repair: First you learn; then you teach.

In extract 5.7 another student is practicing the *el stl'i kw'els*, 'I want to' construction. This extract illustrates the very provisional authority of the non-native speaker instructor.

(5.7) September 22, (LR): kw'els I think

- | | | |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. S | <i>°el stl'i kw'es</i> (2.2) | I want (that 3p) |
| 2. SR | <i>kw'els</i> I think, | that I |
| 3. S | <i>kw'els</i> | that I |
| 4. SR | but let's ask her (.7) | |
| 5. S | was it <i>el stl'i kw'els</i> or <i>el stli kw'es</i> . (.6) | I want that I or
I want that he |

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------|---------------|
| 6. E | <i>el stl'i kw'els</i> | I want that I |
| 7. S | [oh kw'els | that I |
| 8. SR | <i>kw'els</i> (1.9) | that I |

Here both the learner and I focus on the form of the construction, *el stl'i kw'els*, 'I want that I'. My fragment of the construction in line 2 introduces a focus on the pronoun referent. After the student echoes this chunk, I suggest that we turn the repair over to the authoritative voice of the elder. The learner asks the elder for confirmation, and orients to the receipt of this confirmation with 'oh' in line 7. We both echo the approved form in lines 7-8. Having redirected the repair it takes a clear trajectory: clarification request-answer-oh-echo.

In extract 5.8, the learner tries again, as she tried in extracts 5.3 and 5.6, to add recursively a complement clause. That is, she tries to justify why she wants to learn the language.

(5.8) September 22, (LR): I want to learn it to teach

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| 1. S | oh <i>te' iwest</i> ,
is that all I hadda change? (1) | (to) teach |
| 2. E | <i>el stl'i kw'els tolt?</i> (.5)
<i>e'e</i> | I want to learn it,
yes |
| 3. S | <i>el stl'i kw'els tolt iwest</i>
<i>halkomelem</i> (.9) [(xx)] | I want to learn it (to teach)
Halkomelem |
| 4. E | [you don't use <i>iwest</i> (5) | teach it |
| 5. S | o::h, kay | |
| 6. E | right? (.3) | |
| 7. SR | cuz that's [teach | |
| 8. S | [yeah that's the teach | |

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|-----|
| 9. | E | <i>e'e</i> (1.5) cuz you said I want
[to learn | yes |
| 10. | S | [to learn (.4) | |
| 11. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 12. | S | mhm | |
| 13. | E | <i>e'e</i> (2) | yes |

Although the student's attempted constructions in both lines 1 and 3 are non-target, their non-target-ness is not the elder's focus. The elder does not repair the construction, which would (perhaps) require another subordinating structure, *el stl'i kw'els tolt kw'els iwest (kw'e) Halkomelem*. Instead, the elder repairs the output to a single complement (*el stl'i kw'els tolt*), which meets the pragmatic limits of the meta-justification, as argued below.

In extract 5.9, the learner again uses a not-quite-target recursively embedded purpose clause, but with a more appropriate complement: *I want to Verb in order to Verb*, or, specifically, 'I want to learn Halkomelem to get better'.

(5.9) September 22, (LR): take the "te" out

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1. | S | ↓ <i>el stl'i kw'els tolt</i>
<i>halkomelem</i> (.7)
<i>te mayt?</i> (.6) <i>me eylexw</i> (.8) | I want to learn
Halkomelem
(to) help (to get good?) |
| 2. | E | <i>mayt me eylexw</i> | help to get good |
| 3. | S | <i>mayt</i> | help |
| 4. | E | take the [<i>t'</i> take the [<i>te'</i> out | |
| 5. | S | [<i>te</i> [i] <i>te</i> (xx) | |
| 6. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 7. | S | oh. it shortened up | |

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|---|-----|
| 8. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 9. | S | sort of hh | |
| 10. | E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 11. | S | hh I was trying to make it three minutes long | |
| 12. | all | ((extended laughter)) | |

The student uses the superfluous article *te* in her first turn, possibly because it is phonologically similar to the unstressed English infinitive 'to'. The elder then directs her to remove it in line 4. The salient point here is that while both attempts to do a justification (in line 3 of extract 5.8 and line 1 of extract 5.9) were non-target like, this one gets repaired. I suggest that the non-target form became a repairable in extract 5.9 because it is now couched in a pragmatically appropriate meta-justification. It is appropriate to intend to learn the language to become better at it, not to teach it when you don't know it yet, and it is worth repairing the form of such an intention.

Given the frequent opportunity for the single elder speaker available to offer repair of non-target learner production, it appears there is not sufficient justification to do so when the intent does not meet some pragmatic⁴⁴ threshold. Otherwise repair could be an overly exhausting process. So potential repairables become actual repairables (i.e. worthy of repair) when what is being said is sufficiently culturally appropriate.

This extended interaction is finished with the student's humorous spin on the cause of the repairable in line 11 and the extended joint laughter, which typically signals closure for any topic.

5.2.2.2 LR Class #2, (November 10): Description and examples

In contrast to the extensive use of Halkomelem in the above interaction, an interaction doing a justification in the November 10 class, shown in extract 5.10, involves no target language beyond *e'e*. Prior to this, the learner had been involved in an extended task of her own, focusing on the form of the auxiliaries *mi*, 'to come (Verb)' and *la* or *las*, 'to go (Verb)'. In extract 5.10 she justifies that alternate focus.

⁴⁴ I use *pragmatics* in the very general sense relating to context-dependent meaning versus *semantic* meaning or a syntactic structure (see Saeed, 1997, p. 93).

Table 5.2: Turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification using L2 in LR classes. Note: The following abbreviations are used in this table: FOF= focus on form, L2C= target language construction, DAJ= do a justification, C-repair= construction repair, J-repair= justification (pragmatic) repair, S= student, E= elder.

Data set	Class	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
5.1 <i>to want or to love?</i>	LR Sept 22	Student nominates/ joint control	S seeks L2C confirmation- assessment	Locally- managed	L2 C in L1 matrix
5.2 <i>teaching children the language</i>	LR Sept 22	Elder FOF Student DAJ/FOF	E offers C repair	Locally- managed	L2C & DAJ
5.3 <i>maybe you should have</i>	LR Sept 22	Elder control /FOF	E offers C-repair & S accepts/FOF	Locally- managed	L2 + L1 monologue
5.4 <i>to bring it back to life, right?</i>	LR Sept 22	Elder control /FOJ	Monologue with back-channels J-repair	Locally- managed	L2 + L1
5.5 <i>I don't need ts'el?</i>	LR Sept 22	Student control /FOF	S seeks C-repair E starts J-repair	Locally- managed	L2 +L1
5.6 <i>you can't teach a language til you learn it</i>	LR Sept 22	Elder control /FOJ	J- repair	Locally- managed	S/L2C E/lexical + L1
5.7 <i>kw'els I think</i>	LR Sept 22	Teacher control / deferred to elder / FOF	Private speech redirected Question-answer	Locally- managed	Partial L2C
5.8 <i>I want to learn it to teach</i>	LR Sept 22	Bidirectional control/2 topics:FOF/J	S nominates L2C E repairs J	Locally- managed	L2C
5.9 <i>take the 'te' out</i>	LR Sept 22	Joint control/ DAJ + FOF	S DAJ E repairs L2C	Locally- managed	L2C
5.10 <i>preoccupied with this other thing</i>	LR Nov 10	T control attempted	Request/refuse/DAJ	Locally- managed	L1

The first nine extracts in Table 5.2 follow the development of two overlapping goals for primarily two participants, the elder and a learner. As the learner attempts to do a justification she has to clarify and produce a target language purpose clause construction. Pragmatic issues and lexical confusion result in a lengthy repair.

Extract 5.1 introduces the problem between the learner's suggested construction and the possible Halkomelem form, within the interactional structure of a question-answer adjacency pair. However, unlike the *teacher prompt* and *student production*

described by Seedhouse, this interaction involves a *learner production/prompt* and elder *assessment* in the form of a recast.

In extract 5.2, the elder orients to the form of the construction, specifically, the person marker, which she highlights with an elongated vowel in 'that's what's you:::r', in line 1. The learner displays confusion in line 2, with *what!*. When the learner proposes a syntactically complex construction in turn 6, *el stl'i kw'els iwest to sto:lo te stexwiwelh (sto:lo) te halkomelem sqweltel*, 'I want to teach the (Name) children the Halkomelem language', the elder confirms it with the learner over 4 turns *e'e, e'e? e'e, mhm*.

Subsequently, in extract 5.3, the elder's extended repair is supported by the learner with echoic responses (in lines 2, 8 and 10), back channelling (in line 6) and anticipated self-repairs (in lines 4 and 10). The varied and interwoven turn-taking indicates an alignment of perspective between the learner and elder on an agreed-on meaning and shared attention to form.

However, in extract 5.4 the elder nominates a problem in line 1 about lexical choice: *tolt* 'learn', versus *iwest* 'teach', initiating the topic of pragmatic appropriateness. The elder interprets the construction as meaning that the learner should desire to *learn* the language first to bring it back to life. From here on, while the learner seeks confirmation of the form of the construction, (termed C-repair in Table 5.2), the elder begins to repair the meta-justification itself (termed J-repair in Table 5.2). With the exception of data set 5.7, with its simple trajectory of question-answer-oh-echo repair, the data sets 5.4 to 5.9 reflect a lengthy co-construction of meaning through originally unaligned goals and lack of shared perspective until the pragmatic problem is resolved. Then, in extract 5.9 when the learner finally rephrases her justification appropriately, the elder accepts it by then repairing the construction. Success is indicated with agreement, joking, and laughter.

Despite this extended lack of shared perspective in what is being undertaken, and talk which is almost at cross-purposes (about what the learner is trying to say in excerpts 5.1, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6; about whether they are focusing on form or meaning in extract 5.2, 5.5 and 5.6; and what exactly the pronoun markers are in excerpt 5.2), the target language in these extracts contains some of the most structurally complex utterances in the data. The learners rehearse a particular construction, produce it whole, extend it, solicit repair, and clarify its extension within pragmatic limits. During all this, the learners also situate the construction in shared work to establish and clarify doing a justification of why people are learning, teaching and trying to revive an endangered

language. I suggest that although the elder owns the authority to confirm the Halkomelem structure and guide its appropriate articulation, the topic is deeply felt and widely owned by all the co-present participants. In other words, the work of doing a justification, which involves both a focus on form and a focus on pragmatics, is deeply concerned not only with affirming personal but also collective meaning.

The locally-managed struggle for control, whether of the construction or of the pragmatic lack of perspective, the give and take of topic control even when two topics overlap, the variety of sequence types responsive to the gradual working out of shared goals, all facilitate the final consensus on both pragmatic and structural levels. The participants have established intersubjectivity through a complex process of making the target language express their shared perspective. They have done this through a flexible and varied system of interactional structures, primarily locally managed, and often driven by the learners.⁴⁵ A potentially onerous process is constrained by finding a pragmatic common ground first.

In contrast, the lack of shared perspective in extract 5.10, when the learner declines to take part in the assigned task and does an excuse, does not reach so deeply into shared collective concerns. The student's previously self-directed work was primarily a focus on the use of auxiliary verbs (not described in the excerpt). It lacked any noticeable contextualizing or pragmatic hurdles to work out, being involved solely with a focus on form. So while her work may well have served other functions, (e.g., to focus on form), neither the learner nor I produced any target language in the following justification of why she was not ready to participate, other than her one conciliatory *e'e*.

5.2.4 Repair in doing a justification in LR classes

These data include a considerable amount of shared talk that orients to or focuses on doing a meta-justification of trying to learn and teach an endangered language. This work involves extensive collaborative repair. The final data set (extract 5.10) exemplifies a justification for why someone is not doing a specific activity.

Although Seedhouse (2004) found little variation in interaction in a procedural context, he also noted that repair with direct negative evaluation in a procedural context is not generally seen as face-threatening. However, in a form and accuracy context, Seedhouse (2004, pp. 174-175) found that trouble in linguistic form generally elicits

⁴⁵ Similarly to how, Seedhouse (2004, p. 109) notes, in learner-centred approaches the pedagogical focus may be chosen by learners.

extreme mitigation, rather than bald repairs. I found various types of repair in a lengthy interaction that involved doing a justification and which included both a focus on meaning/pragmatics and a focus on the form of an emerging construction. In a summary section I describe seven different types of repair.

The following section describes how procedural talk is repaired in the classes observed and in what kinds of target language. Table 5.3 summarizes talk using target language to do a repair.

Table 5.3 Repair in doing a justification using L2 in LR classes:

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
5.1 <i>to want or to love?</i>	September 22	S-I-O-R	Shared: Request/deny, point/counter-point	Complex clause construction-unfinished
5.2 <i>teaching children the language</i>	September 22	O-I-O-R & S-I-O-R	Propose/accept	Complex clause completed
5.3 <i>maybe you should have...</i>	September 22	O-I-O-R with O-I-S-R	Scaffolded with learner completion	Letter, morpheme or word level
5.4 <i>to bring it back to life, right?</i>	September 22	O-I-O-R	Raise pragmatic problem	L2-L1 (construction)
5.5 <i>I don't need tsel?</i>	September 22	S-I-O-R	Co-construct overlapping repairs	Chunks & complex clause
5.6 <i>you can't teach a language until you learn it</i>	September 22	O-I-O-R	Overlapping repairs (Pragmatics & word)	L2+ L1
5.7 <i>kw'els I think</i>	September 22	O-I-O-R-O-R	Divert repair to elder	Focus on form of chunk of clause
5.8 <i>I want to learn it to teach</i>	September 22	S-I-O-R & O-I-O-R	Pragmatic repair cont.ed	L2-L1 Complex clause + word
5.9 <i>take the 'te' out</i>	September 22	S-I-O-R & O-I-O-R	Propose-repair & accept	L2 & L1 Complex clause, chunks, particle
5.10 preoccupied with this other thing	November 10	O-I-S-R	Laughter	L1

The data include many examples of two primary repair trajectories: self-initiated-other-repair (S-I-O-R) and other-initiated-other repair (O-I-O-R). Seedhouse (2004, p. 147) notes that an S-I-O-R trajectory is usual in L2 classrooms. He notes that the

language typically starts out in target language and then triggers the other-repair by switching to L1. This happens possibly at the point where the learner cannot proceed farther, or wants confirmation that the construction is target-like (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 147). Seedhouse sees this strategy as arising in a context of focus on form-and-accuracy, in which learners need to produce “a precise string of forms” (op.cit. p. 148).

Extract 5.1 illustrates this strategy. In line 1 of extract 5.1, the learner does a justification using a complex clause and then switches to her L1 to ask for verification: *el stl'i te iwesteleq te halq' te, would I say?, 'I want [teacher] the Halkomelem, would I say'*

However, these data both corroborate Seedhouse's functional explanation and extend it. Seedhouse's main thesis is that interaction reflects the pedagogical focus, and he situates this particular strategy within a focus on form. I have described this interaction as having a shared pedagogical focus on form and also on meaning, or specifically pragmatics. The elder's turn in line 2 begins the other-repair with *el stl'i kw'els iwels* but then invites the learner to clarify, mirroring back the original S-I-O-R invitation trajectory initiated by the learner. When the learner repairs with *that was on the other one we love to teach. this is on we want to teach* in line 3, the point-counterpoint nature of the repair reflects how both interactants have taken responsibility for the precise string of words. The elder is responsible for its target form. The learner is responsible for her own meaning, specifically, to do a justification. The shared repair trajectory reflects this joint co-construction of the repair.

In extract 5.2, the elder initiates an O-I-O-R trajectory in line 1. The repair reflects a focus on form, specifically the pronoun. In line 6 the learner asks for verification of a complex construction, with an S-I-O-R trajectory. Three turns of 'e'e's, an agreement marker in the L1 (mhm, in line 10), and 8 seconds of silence indicate completion of this other-repair.

Extract 5.3 illustrates several mitigated, non-face-threatening other-repair trajectories which both trigger repair and scaffold the learner's production. The elder identifies the repairables with *maybe you should have* (in line 1), *maybe you could have a 's'* (in line 7), and finally in line 9, *this part here you could have um (1.6)*. The pause creates a TRP for the next speaker to complete the syntactic chunk. The student does so at turn 8, whispering. The elder's O-I-O-R trajectory is the main repair route. However it scaffolds a series of both echoed and anticipated repairs by the learner, or O-I-S-Rs.

In extract 5.4 the elder raises a pragmatic repairable in line 1. The learner indicates minimal alignment or back-channels with *mhm* in line 2 of this O-IO-R trajectory. In extract 5.5 the learner manages a series of S-I-O-R trajectories, eliciting repairs of grammatical form. The repairs are initiated in lines 1,3,7,and 9 and are repaired in lines 2, 4, 8, and 10 by the elder. The elder also initiates an O-I-O-R in line 6 with *uh*, which triggers the learner's following S-I-O-R in line 7. However, the elder's final other-repair in extract 5.5 focuses back on meaning. This focus extends into extract 5.6 where in lines 1, 3, and 5, the elder once again focuses on the lack of intersubjectivity over the pragmatic issue of whether you can teach Halkomelem before you learn it.

My referred repair (other-repair to yet-other-repair) in line 2 of extract 5.7 illustrates the use of borrowed authority by a non-native speaker teacher. The referred repair is an other-repair that leads to a yet-other-repair.

The justification undergoes continued repair in extract 5.8. The learner self-initiates in line 1, but in line 3 continues to propose her non-target construction to do a different kind of justification than the elder accepts *el stl'I kw'els tolt iwest halkomelem*, 'I want to learn to teach Halkomelem. The elder other-repairs this with a bald repair in line 4, "you don't use *iwest*", switching to English to complete the pragmatic repair.

The pragmatic repair that began in extract 5.1 is finally resolved in extract 5.9. The learner self-initiates an other-repair with rising intonation in line 1. The elder then recasts the learner's construction in line 2. This structural repair of the learner's construction suggests the elder is now orienting to the form, not the previous problematic meaning. She then does a bald repair in line 4 with an other-initiated other-repair ('take the *te* out').

The switch from a self-initiated other-repair in extract 5.1 to mitigated other-repair by the elder in extract 5.3 to direct other-initiated other-repair in extract 5.9, line 4, reflects the shared but changing control over choice and scope of repairables. Change in control of these factors reflects the pedagogical shift from a focus on meaning/pragmatics to a focus on the form of an emerging construction.

The data from extract 5.10 suggest an alternative repair trigger. Laughter in lines 3 and 5 after the learner's demur at taking part in the activity and my assessment of her alternate task may trigger the learner doing a justification with a subsequent other-initiated self-repair trajectory in line 6. Laughter could also indicate support, not other-initiated repair, but the learner's turn starter, *well but* in line 6, suggests that the learner

has oriented to the laughter by providing a justification. She treats the repairable not as a repairable, but as a justifiable alternative (*I got preoccupied with this other thing*) to a previous invitation (*can we have a report back*). The particle *right* in line 6 invites the other participants to share this justification, which is delivered in L1.

To summarize, I found seven types of repair in doing a justification in the LR classes. In the following sections I describe these types of repair as the following categories and include examples from the data, following Seedhouse's (2004, pp. 165-168) strategies for conducting repair. My categories reflect all types used, whereas Seedhouse cites strategies of mitigated negative evaluation⁴⁶.

5.2.4.1 Learner asks for elder to verify target form.

In this strategy the learner asks the native speaker to verify the form. Examples are:

(5.1) ... would I say?

(5.2) is it- is it...

(5.8) is that all I hadda change?

The learner has proposed a target language utterance and switches to English to confirm its target-ness. The repair trajectory is S-I-O-R. with a switch to L1.

5.2.4.2 Intonation cue.

In this strategy the speaker uses an intonation cue. An example is:

(5.5) el stl'i? I want?

The learner produces a target language utterance using rising intonation with no switch to L1. The elder treats it as a S-I-O-R request and gives her evaluation in target language.

5.2.4.3 Mitigated repair by elder.

In this strategy the native speaker does a mitigated repair. An example is:

(5.3) maybe you should have ah *yexw* in there.

⁴⁶ Seedhouse (2004, pp. 163-164) was specifically interested in the minimal use of bald, unmitigated, direct, overt negative evaluation in a form on accuracy context and was documenting mitigated negative evaluations.

The elder directs the repairs with an O-I-O-R trajectory but uses mitigated syntax in the learner's L1. She only code switches to target language for the specific repairable.

5.2.4.4 Explicit negative evaluation by elder

In this strategy the speaker gives an explicit negative evaluation. Examples are:

(5.4) ah no what (1.1) (followed by clarification question)

(5.8) you don't use iwest (5)

The elder directly contradicts the learner's utterance. She is addressing a pragmatic problem and also a lexical choice repairable. The repair is direct and functions to identify a problem categorically. In 5.8 specifically the problem is identified as the word choice.

5.2.4.5 Explicit repair by elder: specify the error

In this strategy the native speaker explicitly specifies the error. An example is:

(5.9) take the 'te' out

The elder is doing a repair once the pragmatic problem is fixed. The repair is direct and focuses on the structural problem.

5.2.4.6 Defer to authority of elder

In this strategy a non-speaker instructor defers to the authority of the native speaker. An example is:

(5.7) but let's ask her

After I offer a repair of the non-target form and then confirm the learner's target form I seek the authority of the elder to verify that it is correct. This exemplifies one way a non-native speaker is authorized to give input.

5.2.4.7 Elder recasts repairable

In this strategy the elder simply recasts the learner's utterance. An example is:

(5.9) mayt me eylexw help get better

The elder repairs the repairable with a quick O-I-O-R correction, which the learner does not 'get'. This is followed by *take the te out*, which more specifically identifies the repairable.

5.2.5 Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in LR classes

These data describe interaction in a context of doing a justification in the LR classes. My findings contrast with those of Seedhouse (2004). I did not find the assumed IRF/IRE interaction pattern suggested for classroom discourse, or, as discussed in section 4.2.5, that in a procedural context language production was mostly formulaic and delivered in teacher monologues. My data reflect a more varied interactional dynamic that supported emergence of some quite complex constructions. Specifically, these data show a range of repair options in doing classroom repair from bald *no*-s to highly mitigated negative evaluations in the focus on form context.

The interaction also illustrates how participants manage to focus on (a) the form of an emerging construction used to do a justification of the learner's personal goals and dreams, (b) lexical appropriateness and (c) a pragmatic repairable identified by the elder. There is a tension between the authority of the elder to authorize the target construction and the authority of the learner to express her own thoughts. This tension is reflected in a dynamic and locally-managed sharing of control and in the use of alternating repair trajectories during the ongoing work of co-constructing meaning. Once again, a genuine problem in understanding, involving talk at cross-purposes for some time, required extensive work to establish intersubjectivity. This work helped scaffold the learner to produce a complex construction in Halkomelem and to use it meaningfully.

These data illustrate one context in which interactants struggle to establish mutual understanding and situate it in appropriate cultural ways. This context shares some aspects of the significant and often intense interaction of people in everyday life, the very context that motivates and supports learning any language.

5.3 Language Immersion (LI) classes and doing a justification

The data are again drawn from three classes, as described in Section 3.3.2. In the following section I summarize the language output in the context of doing a justification in the LI classes, and briefly categorize the output in terms of structural complexity.

5.3.1 Language output doing a justification in LI classes

Table 5.4 summarizes the target language output by complexity, in the context of doing a justification for each LI class, by speaker. No target language doing a justification was recorded in the second class.

Table 5.4: Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification in LI classes

Date	Speaker	name	Lang. name	particle	1 word	formulaic	clause 1 verb	clause >1 verb
Sept 26	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T	5	3	3	1	2	-	-
	Ss	3	1	-	-	-	-	-
Oct 3	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Ss	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oct 4, '04	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T	8	-	-	-	5	-	-
	Ss	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Talk doing a justification in the first class exemplified Seedhouse's findings more closely than the previously documented (LR) classes. The instructor used minimal target language and often spoke in extended monologues. Her total target language in the first class consisted of people's Halkomelem names, the name of the language, one routinized expression, *plis te sqeptset*, 'blessed be our gathering', and three isolated particles, all embedded in a matrix of English. The types of target language utterances used doing a justification in the LI classes are shown in Figure 5.2 below.

Figure 5.2: Types of target language utterances in LI classes, doing a justification

<i>Teacher</i>		
name	Susal	Susan
language name	Halkomelem	Halkomelem
word	ts'ets'a	on top of
particle	te	the
formulaic	plis te sqeptset	blessed be our gathering

As well as the name of the task to recite a prayer, *plis te sqeptset*, 'blessed be our gathering,' students and the instructor consistently used either traditional Halkomelem names or 'Halkomelem-ized' English names (e.g., *Susal* for Susan, *Popele* for Barbara). The one complex word *Halkomelemqel* appears to have been initially rote-learned and morphologically unanalyzed. One student had noted in the baseline class (September 26) that she had heard the complex word *Halkomelemqel*, 'the Halkomelem language,' but did know how that differed from *Halkomelem*, 'the Halkomelem people.'

In the October 3 class, the elder provided an extended justification entirely in English. This addressed historical losses, traditional practices, and proper protocol. Specifically, she justified the need for the women students to *get up and talk today*, though traditionally men were the speakers, as the men today *if they do know the language, they will not get up and speak*.

For the lesson of October 4, 2004, the instructor introduced the jigsaw task. This involved a lengthy justification of its use and of my contribution. However, target language use was limited to peoples' names and to four idiomatic phrases. The teacher addressed this limited use explicitly. She cited two phrases, *ey swayel*, 'good day', and *li chxw we ey ò*, 'how are you' as expressions representing the usual limit of target language interaction in this class. She suggested the expression *qwamqwent ta' sqwalewel*, 'be strong'⁴⁷ as an expression for the learners to research during the class with the elder's help.

⁴⁷ Miller (2007, p. 26) quotes Sonny McHalsie as saying the expression *be of good mind*, which is often heard in longhouse ritual, "refers to the practice of avoiding bad thoughts (which can harm others) and of having faith that the work undertaken together... can continue". That seems a more literal translation of *qwamqwent ta' sqwalewel*.

5.3.2 Interaction in LI: Data examples and description by class

In this section, I give data samples to describe the types of interaction in doing a justification in the LI classes. The instructor's talk is extensive and often monologic. The students' talk is conversational. Most talk doing a justification is in English.

5.3.2.1 LI Class #1, (September 26): Description and examples

In the first LI class I attended, the instructor spent quite a bit of time justifying the recent shift in the program from writing to oral speaking. In extract 5.11, she justifies the switch in a lengthy monologue.

(5.11) September 26 (HI): "you say the prayer"

1. T (it's good) *te* keep practicing in in here without reading it (.) an (.) that way you're you're hearing it, yer just saying it ? and you don't have to read it. an if you get into a um (.) place where they say oh(.) **you're** here **you're** in the language program, **you** say the prayer (.) an you don't need to go pulling it out n (.) n then you'll be able to read it an (.) ,h so (.)h ↑this (.) ↑this semester, →we don't want you to take the *plis te sqeptset* you're next, the the following semester we'll we start with the Indian prayer? an we go the two semesters so you have to memorize **that** prayer (.)h but (.) for last semester and this semester it would be (.) we were reading from (.) ah everybody takin turns reading the *plis te sqeptset* but this term ah don't try not to look at it so we'll just read it an,(.) (.)h we'll review I want to review once a week (.) now (.) with this (.) um a lot (hh) (.) I find when (.) the students are getting up and writing on the board in the IPTE program (.)h they are forgetting (.) their (.) vowels and their consonants. (2) and they are not they're not able to (.) to write what they are hearing so it is important that we um(.) we keep the um *halkomelemqel* (.) clear (.) (.)h and (.) keep going over it, (h) so that you don't forget, so it it's easy to forget. it's easy to (.) to change the sound. So, if we could get (3) u:m (elder Name) (h) to read the um *halkomelemqel* and we're not goin to do the long and short vowels this morning but

we'll just do the whole thing (.h) and then we'll um (.) then we'll start our with our lessons

...

2. E so how do you want it? do you want uh i?

In extract 5.11, the instructor does a lengthy justification of both the upcoming choral recitation task to review the sounds of the phoneme chart and the subsequent assignment to learn a prayer (the *plis te sqeptset*). She reviews the failures of past approaches, citing the difficulties previous students had in gaining oral fluency, reading out loud, or using the practical orthography as a pronunciation aid. She cites earlier students *who have forgotten their vowels and consonants* and cannot read things in the language appropriately. Specifically, students were not able to maintain the phonemic sound distinctions. The instructor orients to expectations from the communities that language students should take part in community events and at a minimum be able to perform a prayer in Halkomelem, *if you get into a place where they say*.

The instructor's monologue addresses several issues: community expectations, needs of learners, and previous program limitations. She also provides an extended time line in which learners only need to try to recite the *plis te sqeptset* prayer. The actual task is difficult to understand from the monologue, (as seen by the elder who asks in her next turn for clarification), but the justification for doing it is thorough.

In extract 5.12, the teacher does a justification for the new format of the program by contrasting it with the previous program in which *they were just writing and writing and writing* (and everyone) *lost the concept of ...trying to say things*. This had been the crux of the problem as perceived by the teachers, the students, and the community. There had been no focus on speaking and no sign of anyone learning to speak from the learning activities being used.

(5.12) September 26 (LI): "they were just writing and writing and writing"

1. T we said you have a spelling test tomorrow and sometimes it was thirty words.
2. SR mhm

3. T and they were just writing and writing and writing (.h) and where they were writing is all they were doing was trying to write the word
4. SR mhm
5. T as they were and they were they lost the concept ↑ we lost the concept (.h) of (.) trying to <say things>
6. SR mhm
7. T so now we said (2) we haven't got five days a week any more (1) we- you're cut down to only (1) what is it four- four [hours
8. SR [mhm
9. T eight eight hours a week (.) that from from (.) from the last term . (.h) everything is cut down so (.) your not I want te (.) just concentrate listen to yer ah CDs, >concentrate on the work<, (.h) see how theyre using it in the vocab, (.h)
10. SR ye- yup
11. T and try to say well (.) ken I say it this way an- and if you write it down or you remember it and you come in and you say (.h) is this right if I use this at home and you ask (Name) and she'll say yes or no: then then it will be (.)
12. SR right
13. T (x) do it
14. SR ↓yeah
15. T but this is this is all I need you to do is go through this refreshed? and the next time we come in we'll go through it. (1)
16. S °okay

17. S ↑that's what I was doing with um (1) ↓I wanna say (.) her
halkomelem name...

In extract 5.12, the teacher addresses her monologue to me, as a new visitor/researcher to the class. I give frequent back-channels at TRPs to support her turn. The teacher reviews the previous decision to change focus in order to have the students listen to the newly produced CDs, to think how to say things, and come to class and ask the elder there. However, her pre-telling in line 7, *so now we said...* also functions to re-justify the process to the co-present students and redirect the procedure. A student responds with agreement at a TRP in line 16. Another student further supports the teacher's advice in turn 17 by testifying how she came to class and asked for help from an advanced student.

The teacher achieves the monologue form through a number of turn-keeping strategies, specifically, by doing a 'rush-through' with raised volume and pitch at a TRP, audible in-breaths, and pauses at non TRPs (i.e., in mid-syntactic structure). These strategies do not invite turn changes and do not result in turn-changes. With the exception of the elder's name, the justification is delivered in English.

(5.13) September 26 (LI): "This says this and this says that"

1. S I find the linguistics part is really like pulling stuff together now
2. SR oh good
3. S I'm like [(who:)]
4. SR [(laughter)]
5. S ↑that's why it's been like tha:t
6. E ((laughter))
7. T *e'e* yes
8. S (xxx) so how come this says this and this says that=
9. SR yeah
10. S =but it's the same word. (.5)

11. E ((laughter)) [(laughter))
12. S [you know what I mean?
but let's- just there's =
13. SR yeah
14. S =a change at the end or something?
15. SR yeah (1)
16. S (h) fi:nally somebody's [answering my question
17. SR [oh goo::d
[oh excellent=
18. S [my brain's going ↑oh yeay
19. e.o. ((laughter))
20. E and some of them verbs
21. S (xx!)
22. ? yeah
23. E that eh- if they ever showed you how they (.) change

In extract 5.13, a student contrasts the Linguistics class with the previous program. Her lengthy justification ultimately takes 102 turns, which are not all shown here. She reports (in line 8) that an explanation of why *this says this and this says that* is helpful, rather than just being told that is how the elders wrote it. That is, the linguistics class has helped through its analysis of the inflectional morphology of the language, and, specifically, through exposing learners to the form and meaning of verbal suffixes (i.e., *some of them verbs*).

A motivation for doing a justification must certainly include the presence of someone documenting the classroom. Accordingly, much of the talk does seem to

function to include the researcher (me), to justify my inclusion, and to justify to me the direction of activities.

5.3.2.2 LI Class #2 (October 3): Description and examples

One learner in this class is preparing a speech that she will give at a wedding that weekend. The elder justifies the practice time on that task. The elder first directs a justification to me for the need to prepare speakers of the language, not just writers. Traditionally these would have been men, and the students and elder then address this issue.

(5.14) October 3, (LI): "they will not get up and speak"

1. E you gotta get up there and talk.
2. SR yeah
3. E you: know (1) there's no-one that can
4. SR yeah
5. E speak the language. you can't you know
6. S so the [(words)
7. E [and a lot of the men if they do: know the language, they will not
get up and
8. SR [mhm
9. E [speak=
10. SR mhm
11. E =the language=
12. SR mhm mhm
13. E =that is, you know. yeah
14. E [so

15. S1 [so it was our men that spoke it before we did? (.)]
16. S1 [(xx) stood up- no we spoke it
17. E [no no, you know the:y
18. S1 [(for speech)
19. E long time ago [they all knew the language but the men were (the) speakers

In extract 5.14, the elder justifies the task again. She cites the problem that no-one now can speak Halkomelem (in lines 3, 5), and that even if the men can, they will not (in line 7). This leads into a discussion about historical protocol over whether and when women spoke (in lines 15- 19). Subsequent to this, participants reflect on appropriate protocol for paying a designated speaker, that is, how it is supposed to be done.

5.3.2.3 LI Class #3 (October 1): Description and example

In this class, the teacher is helping me to set up the interactive jigsaw task. She provides an extensive justification in another lengthy monologue.

(5.15) October 1 (LI): Jigsaw class: “you wanna start saying something else”

T and an- the the majority of this (.h) this session what you need to get out of this out of this level four is the material we’re going to go through and the help and the help we’re getting with susal, is making you speak more. gettin confident in in everyday conversation. using the words and the words that you ha:ve making up your own phrases that yer goin to use to say to someone and you say it properly. (3) ...but when you s- but when you wanna- you also wanna use the uh greetings, (.h) other than what we’re always saying. you know. um oh ey swayel. (.h) li chexw we eyo. that’s good but you wanna start saying something else, (.h) to them, to talk to them, (.h) n say you want to say at least conversation. te te speak with each other. (1) n say is that, ‘n (Name) is here. and she an- she’s (2) going to -we’ll have a lot of fun in saying yeah, you know, is that right,...you need to ask the

questions because (1) this is yer last this is yer la:st session (1) in the immersion program, (.h) this is yer last session, that (.) yer going to have the opportunity (.) of a fu:ll day on friday, to ask (Name), am I saying this right, is this right, (1.5) so you really have to take advantage of this day, (1) and (.) and (.) that's all I have to say to you. (2) and and I don't know how long (.) (.h) how many times susal can (.) come down? she's a busy a very busy lady herself, she's teaching (.h) um in kamloops, an- but when she is able to come down she will be with us and working (.h) an- doing tapes, (.h) (1) with us (.) susal?

((elder recites the vocabulary words slowly for the following task; students echo them))

In extract 5.15, the teacher is giving a pep talk to the students, reminding them about their goals, their homework, and re-introducing both me and the jigsaw task to the class. She covers various critical issues, some not quoted here. These include the need to extend memorized speech to more conversational and creative use, which I am presumably introduced to expedite. She also reminds the students to check appropriateness with the elder and urges them to take advantage of the resources provided as time is running out for them in the program.

In this extract, the teacher does a justification on three levels. She justifies (a) the need to focus on speaking and (b) the need to use elder time strategically. She also justifies (c) my involvement and research. She frames my involvement as a contribution toward the goal of increasing fluency.

5.3.3 Turn-taking in doing a justification in LI classes

In the following section, I describe the turn-taking characteristics in procedural talk that contains target language in LI classes. Table 5.5 summarizes the turn-taking characteristics of target language data for doing a justification in this class.

Table 5.5: Turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification using L2 in LI class

Data set	Class	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
5.11 <i>you say the prayer</i>	Sept. 26	Teacher controls	Monologue	Locally-managed	Idioms, names in L1 matrix
5.12 <i>writing and writing</i>	Sept. 26	Teacher controls	Monologue with back channels	Locally-managed	Names in L1 matrix
5.13 <i>this says this</i>	Sept. 26	Student controls	A telling with back channels	Locally-managed	L1 / no L2
5.14 <i>they will not speak</i>	Oct 3	Elder controls	Monologue & question-answer	Locally-managed	L1 / no L2
5.15 <i>you wanna start saying something else</i>	Oct 1, '04	Teacher controls	Monologue & speaker selects next speaker	Locally-managed	Names & idioms in L1 matrix Traditional turn-ender in translation

The data samples from this class exemplify a range of types of turn-taking in the context of doing a justification. They vary from largely monologic to a more conversational type of shared telling. However, all the data sets illustrate some kind of locally-managed talk.

The instructor takes a lengthy monologic turn in extract 5.11 to justify the need to work on oral production of the phoneme chart, citing previous failures of the program as well as community needs and expectations. The teacher controls the topic (the justification). The lengthy turn is largely in English, which presumably facilitates both its production and comprehension. However, the instructor uses a few target language terms in her TCUs. These include the language name and the name of the assigned prayer.

In extract 5.12, the instructor initially directs her monologue to me. I support her turn with frequent back channels, until the focus switches to the students in line 7. The monologue ends when one student self-selects a turn and starts a sharing of her experience in line 17.

In extract 5.13, a student does a justification of another approach, telling about her experience with the linguistics class. A group of listeners supports this telling with even more frequent back channels of agreement particles and laughter. The elder

supports and extends the telling further in line 20 with *and some of them verbs*. The turn-taking is like that of ordinary conversation and the interaction is entirely in L1.

In extract 5.14, the elder does another justification of the current focus on oral fluency. Her turn is monologic, with my backchannels, until someone raises a clarification question in line 15. The elder answers this question at lines 17 and 19.

In extract 5.15, the instructor does a justification of the upcoming jigsaw activity in a lengthy monologue. She contrasts the aim of the jigsaw task, to facilitate oral production, with previous activities that did not involve any target language production beyond very rudimentary idiomatic phrases. Once again, doing a justification requires everyone's L1 to be comprehensible.

The teacher indicates the end of her monologue explicitly in extract 5.15 with *and that's all I have to say to you*⁴⁸. When I did not jump in after this updated turn ender, which signaled an opportunity for next turn entry, the instructor addressed my limited availability more directly in her next TCU. Finally, she offered an explicit 'speaker selects next speaker' manoeuvre in the final line.

Overall, doing a justification in this context is very similar to Seedhouse's (2004, p. 139) finding that conveying procedural instructions favours a monologue. In some instances of doing a justification, there is an almost complete suspension of turn-taking. One actual turn not included here is more than one page of single-spaced transcript, with no back-channeling recorded. Another turn, in extract 5.12, has back-channelling from me, but the topic trajectory is controlled by the instructor. Doing a justification in extract 5.14 is also monologic by the elder and justifies why the women students must now take over public speaking duties. Only in extract 5.13, when one student expresses relief at finding *this says this and this says that*, do all participants more jointly construct a sort of conversational 'gripe session'. It is entirely in English.

5.3.4 Repair in doing a justification in LI classes

The following section describes how procedural talk is repaired in the LI classes observed. Table 5.6 below summarizes the procedural talk using target language to do repair in LI classes.

⁴⁸ Speakers in both lower mainland dialect groups of Halkomelem have now adapted a traditional Halkomelem phrase, *hoy chxw q'a*, (literally) 'you have finished', which literally recognizes the end of another speaker's turn, to indicate the speaker's own turn ending.

Table 5.6: Repair in doing a justification using L2 in LI classes

Data set	Date	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
5.11 <i>you say the prayer</i>	September 26	S-I-S-R	Keep speaker turn	L1
5.12 <i>writing and writing</i>	September 26	S-I-S-R	Keep speaker turn & redirect turn to students	L1
5.13 <i>this says this</i>	September 26	S-I-S-R	Self-editing	L1
5.14 <i>they will not get up and speak</i>	October 3	O-I-O-R	Bald, focus on protocol	L1
5.15 <i>you wanna start saying something else</i>	October 1, '04	S-I-S-R	Keep speaker turn	L1

The instructor in this class uses a variety of repair strategies to manage and maintain her turns. In extract 5.11, she uses repetition of partial syntactic constituents and extensive self-initiated self-repairs at possible TRPs to hold an extended turn. She serially repeats TCU starts: *an* (.) *an*, *this* (.) *this*, *the* *the*; abruptly topic shifts; and uses many coordinate particles (*and*, *but*), supported by frequent audible breath intakes. All these strategies support a *phonetic rush-through* at potential TRPs.

The instructor's self-repair in line 5 of data set 5.12, *as they were and they were they lost the concept* ↑ *we lost the concept*, also functions to redirect the scope of the justification from reporting to me on students' problems to a wider problem: *we lost the concept*. Then, in line 7 she uses a pronoun switch from *we* to *you* to address the students directly: *we haven't got five days a week any more; we-you're cut down to only what is it four- four hours....*

In line 12 of extract 5.13, the student speaker self-repairs, *but let's- just there's*, during her telling about her experience. Back channeling in lines 13 and 15 supports both the student's self-repair and her telling at each TRP. Group laughter at line 19 initiates a turn change.

In extract 5.14, a student asks a comprehension question in line 15: *so it was our men that spoke it before we did?* The student then self-repairs in line 16 to *no we spoke it*. The elder follows this with a direct or bald other-repair in lines 17 and 19, *no no, you know the:y- long time ago they all knew the language but the men were (the) speakers*. This explicit negative evaluation supports Seedhouse's (2004, pp. 172-175) observation that a direct

(or bald) *no* in a focus on procedure is not interpreted as face threatening, unlike in the case of a linguistic judgement. In this example, the elder is focusing on an issue of protocol, specifically, who spoke traditionally and who should currently do the speaking for the community at ceremonial events.

In extract 5.15, the instructor again self-repairs with many restarts and repetitions. These all serve to maintain a lengthy turn in which the instructor does a thorough justification of my presence and of the proposed new activity. Her re-start of a closing, *and I don't know how long...* attempts to repair a failed turn switch at a TPR.

In these data, repair manages the justification, elicits cultural-historical explanations, and generally secures the instructor's extended turns. However, it does not support much target language use in this class beyond the use of target language names.

5.3.5 Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in LI classes

The data from these classes support Seedhouse's observations that procedural talk is largely delivered in monologue form and tolerates bald repair, at least in interactions controlled by one authoritative speaker. In this context, the authoritative speaker is the instructor or the elder. The extended explanations in doing a justification seem to necessitate delivery in L1 for both learners and teachers. Target language use is restricted to target language names, the name of the language, and occasional idioms, all used in an English language matrix (as shown in Table 5.5). These restricted uses may still help to align the interaction as a language learning one and to situate the learners as participants in that work. Specifically, using Halkomelem names helps to mark learners as Halkomelem. This program is noteworthy in that respect. Although almost no one was using the language beyond very limited phrases, as noted by the instructor in extract 5.15, almost everyone uses their traditional names extensively. As Swain and Lapkin (2008, p. 122) suggested⁴⁹, this may function "to provide solidarity and cohesion".

5.4 Linguistics classes and doing a justification

Much of the talk in the linguistics class was meta-linguistic talk about verb morphology, or what one student referred to appreciatively as *this means this and this*

⁴⁹ Swain and Lapkin were referring to other repetitions, specifically, lexical repetitions in a French immersion context.

means that. The instructor frequently qualified his current linguistic analyses in two ways: (a) in terms of needing further research, and (b) in turning to the elder to confirm and justify his current analysis of the form and meaning of target language structures.

The elder held a revered position of authority and respect. She had worked with the students for years. She had been the working partner of another beloved elder-speaker, who had recently passed away at the time of research. Her word was law. However, she was only sparingly asked for input in the linguistics class. Her voice largely functioned in the class to justify the interpretations of current linguistic analysis, rather than to provide direct input to the learners. The primary language input was mostly provided by her late colleague's voice on the CD ROM or her own recorded voice, even in her own presence.

Consequently, a further 'voice' in this class was the sound of the CD ROM, which functioned to move the task ahead. The CD ROM provided both the target language form through the elders' recorded voices, as well as affirmed that student translations were appropriate. In other words, it provided the input as well as the evaluation/feedback phase of the traditional IRE classroom interaction pattern.

The instructor also holds a privileged position in class. As official linguist for the Nation, he had regular access to the elder in linguistic elicitation sessions. His authority as a linguist and as an official knower of the language is validated through the elder's acquiescence in what he says. The relationship between his authority and her justification of that authority is reflected in a unique interactional pattern of interwoven voices.

5.4.1 Language output doing a justification in Linguistics classes

Doing a justification happened within some very teacher-controlled tasks: specifically, in providing English translations of target language words and in spelling words out loud. The students produced specific words or letters, or "precise strings of linguistic forms" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 102). The instructor justified the analysis of these specific linguistic strings. His target language was embedded in an English matrix, as talk about aspects of Halkomelem linguistic structure. Table 5.7 below summarizes the target language output while doing a justification in the linguistics classes.

Table 5.7: Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification: Linguistics classes

Speaker	names	orthographic letters	< 1 word	1 word	complex word	clausal 1 verb
T	9	2	8	5	8	2
elder	0	0	0	0	0	0

Although learners in this class produced precise strings of mostly orthographic letters, the instructor produced a variety of target language types. The elder’s only utterance in this context, *yup*, is not in the target language. The types of target language utterances used while doing a justification in the linguistics classes are shown in Figure 5.3.

Figure 5.3: Types of target language utterances in Linguistics classes in doing a justification

<i>Instructor</i>		
sounds	/ch/	
name	(Name)	
particle	li	there
morpheme	-em	passive suffix
single word	xalh	road / door
complex word	silyólexwe	elders
clause	li ye siyólexwe	there were two elders (there)

Instructor language included a focus on individual sounds, for example /ch/; on morphemes such as the passive suffix or plural marker; on single and complex words; and on two variations of a clause. These were all within an English matrix. As well, the instructor code-switched to the students’ Halkomelem names to address the learners.

5.4.2 Interaction in Linguistics classes: Data examples and description by class

The elder is present in two capacities: both on the CD recording of her voice and in person. These two presences function in different ways. On the CD, she is the authorized provider of target language. In person, she functions to justify the instructor/linguist’s claims to knowledge. Extracts 5.16 and 5.17 illustrate this dual but distanced role when the teacher refers to the elder in third person even when she is co-present.

(5.16) February 18, (Linguistics): “She says”

1. T in (*Name’s*) dialect she says a lot *ch* where other people would say *ts* that’s just a that’s just a dialect variation.
2. T u:.....

In extract 5.16, the elder is referred to by name and with a third person pronoun: *in (Name’s) dialect she says a lot ch*. She is sitting close by but is referenced distally.

(5.17) February 18, (Linguistics): “This is for her”

1. T *xalh* road/door
2. S door or road
3. T °door or road. ↑I was talking to (*Name*) toda:y >this is< for her ro:ad (.) road
4. ? mhm
5. CD ((bling))=
6. T but *yam-* in the story u::h roseline uses it for road. °could only have meant road there
7. S (xx)
8. T I meant (x) it could only have meant doo:r, °she used it for door
9. CD ((bling))

In extract 5.17, the elder does not respond to these announcements by the teacher about her dialect or her lexical choice. She is referred to by name in line 3 and contrasted with the late elder who used *xalh* for ‘door’ in line 6. The use of third person, *this is for her*, also in line 3, distances the voice of the elder from her actual presence to her presence on the CD, or to her earlier presence with the linguist in elicitation work. Extract 5.18 exemplifies another interaction in which the elder’s voice functions to justify the linguistic analysis.

(5.18) February 11, (Linguistics): “Does that sound okay”?

1. T exactly. ((coughs)) (.h) we'll just take a look at the breakdown there (2) so you have (.) uh ↑ *li*: >is one of these little words that (.) linguists can't figure out what it means<. bu::t it can mean 'the:re' (.) and that's probly what it means here, 'there', (.) *ye* is, means, uh 'the', or 'a', or some it can mean all those things, but it's only used with plurals. so we know that the next word is a plural, a::h *selyó:lexwe* is based o:n (.) *siyólexwe*, for elder, and the “L” makes it plural, the (.) “L” >inserted in there makes it plural<, but a lot of times in Halkomelem you don't even use the plural. with with people it's more common it seems like with more high frequency words it it's more common to use the plural form. (.h) but (.) I'm pretty sure you could say *li ye* (.) *siyólexwe* with just the singular form. (Name) does that sound okay? ↑ *liye siyólexwe* (.) *li te lálem*?
2. E yup=
3. T =↓ yup.so (x)↑ so the plural marking is optional (1) um uh *la ilólets'e* a:h (.) *lólets'e* (.) i:s 'one' for counting people, so *let'se* i-is 'one' and then there's a whole system for counting people, ah *lolets'e*, *yeysele*, *lhxwále*, *qa- qa – qethile*? (.)

The elder ratifies the linguist's plural construction in line 2, authorizing him to transmit his analysis. The elder's *yup* seems less a co-construction of meaning than a justification of the linguist's target language utterance. The instructor gives the analysis *I'm pretty sure you could say li ye (.) siyólexwe with just the singular form* and then seeks confirmation from the elder, *does that sound okay?* in line 1. In line 3 he echoes the confirmation with a lower register change, and then switches back to higher volume to present the now ratified analysis.

In extract 5.19, the instructor raises the problem of whether *chiyolh* should be spelled with a colon. That is, he raises the issue of long vowels in Halkomelem.

(5.19) February 11, (Linguistics): “This is a big issue”

1. T *chiyolh*. Ah yes, very good but how do you spell it fire
2. SS ((laughter))

3. Ss C- H- I- Y- O- L -H
4. T is that that is there a colon?
5. SS [T- L
6. S [(xx) I always get confused
7. T ((bling)) this is ↑this a big issue <I just wrote a grant proposal> today to have (.) uh somebody take our dictionary and actually do: length measurements on these words and see which ones are long and which ones are short I think it's a an important thing for us te (.) sort out in this (.) language? (.h) because if you lookit (.) brent's version of the dictionary (.) most wor:ds he says they could be long or it could be short and so I never know what to write. ↓ so. we'll work on that. (2) ah ↑this one. cover oneself.
8. S(s) L-E, hard X- W- (1) ((scattered chorus of voices)) W- E- T

The instructor justifies a need for further linguistic research before the problem of writing vowels can be answered. Despite his authoritative position, he is on guard against claiming more expertise than is his due, and he constantly qualifies the extent of his knowledge as being interim and incomplete. This uncertainty is illustrated in excerpt 5.20.

(5.20) February 11, (Linguistics): "that's why I wanna measure it"

1. T did we write a colon in there or not?=
=
2. SS =yeah, yes oh yes (firewood) ah yeah we do
3. S did we
4. T see ((bling)) I hate to sound like I don't know too much about the language but I don't know if it's long or short. (.) and uh (.) I:z: I just go by what's in the dictionary. and I honestly think the elders might sometimes say it one way sometimes the other. that's why I (xx) wanna measure it. okay. we'll do(2)

In extract 5.20 the instructor again does a justification of the current limited knowledge on the language. He checks with the learners about whether they have been transcribing *firewood* with a long vowel. He invokes the need for further grants and research to clarify vowel length, as *the elders might sometimes say it one way sometimes the other*.

Extract 5.21 illustrates again how the elder's *yup*, between turns 1 and 3, confirms the provided meaning. It also exemplifies the voices in this class. These voices include the instructor, who is the provisionally authorized knower; the elder, who authorizes that knowledge; the students, who attend and translate, and the CD voice, which provides the authorized target language pronunciation. In addition, the extract introduces an absent authority.

(5.21) February 11, (Linguistics class): "Right Tsetselexwot?"

1. T right. they only had snow to drink. (.) h um (1) with this one >lóye is only, only the snow (1) qoqet drink (.) and then -et um (.) >we're working on it<. ↑ I thought it mean would mean (.) possibly we: in in this sort of this would be a sort of a subordinate construction where it could be (.) a we: (.) but (xx) is usually tset but in in some (.) >sort of embedded structures they come out as -et<. but (Name) is pretty clear this means **they** only had snow to drink. right (Name)?
2. E yup=
3. T they only had snow to drink. so it can't mean we; cuz it means **they**, (.0) um and this this wouldn't be they though. they would just be understood. um: (1) so we're still working on what that is. a:h (1)<(Name), said she thinks it might be ah in passives (.) like ah eaten? or drunk? (.) ah in in a sort of an embedded sentence like this it could come as qó:qetemet (.5) the water and you just get the -et added on in the passive so that would mean(.) <<only snow was drunk>> (.) ah (only) yeah only snow could be drunk (.h) um and then the but the -em should be there >which is the passive marker but it's no:t but then (Name) says sometimes it

might disappear< so. that's what gives you some idea what it's like to be a linguist

4. S ((laughter))

This interaction introduces some other significant voices, cited here by the linguist as an exclusive⁵⁰ *we* of the linguistic community. These individuals include the Salishanists who currently work academically on Salish languages. Introducing an absent but authoritative *we* adds a non-participating voice into the classroom dynamic, one referenced but unavailable for interaction.

Several of these voices construct a displaced authority in this learning context. These include someone with privileged and expert knowledge, specifically, the linguist; the ultimate authorized but not linguistically 'expert' knower of the language, the elder; the authoritative recording of the elder's voice via the CD ROM and the exclusive, but largely absent, Salishanist linguistic community. One voice is electronic, one voice is absent and one voice is mostly silent. In this context, the absent authorities, the *bling* of the CD, and the silent presence of the elder all function to support and justify if distally, the authority of the teacher.

5.4.3 Turn-taking and doing a justification in Linguistics classes

In this section, I summarize the turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification in the linguistics class. I relate this to the kind of target language produced, as described in Section 4.2.3. Table 5.8 summarizes the target language data.

⁵⁰ I use the term *exclusive* in the linguistic sense of a first person plural designation that does not include the listeners, in contrast with one that does.

Table 5.8: Turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification using L2 in Linguistic classes

Data set	Class	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
5.16 <i>she says</i>	February 18	Teacher	Monologue	Locally-managed & elder authority invoked	L1, L2 names & isolated sounds
5.17 <i>this is for her</i>	February 18	Teacher	Monologue	Pre-determined & elder authority invoked	L2 word & names in L1 matrix
5.18 <i>does that sound OK?</i>	February 11	Teacher	Monologue & Question-Answer (speaker selects next speaker)	Locally-managed & elder authority invoked	Single L2 words & L2 clause
5.19 <i>a big issue</i>	February 11	Teacher	Question-Answer & monologue	Pre-determined & locally-managed	Spelling letters in L1 matrix
5.20 <i>I wanna measure</i>	February 11	Teacher	Monologue	Locally-managed	L1
5.21 <i>right?</i>	February 11	Teacher	Monologue	Locally-managed	Single words, morphemes and L2 names in L1 matrix

Because the instructor has many hours of access to the elder in regular linguistic elicitation work, he asks for limited support in class, as long as he keeps to previously researched analyses. Both this previous access to the elder and his linguistic expertise enable his long monologic turns. This fosters an interaction pattern whereby the expert teacher holds the floor and manages turns by selecting co-present students to fulfil obligations for second pair responses to question-answer adjacency pairs.

In extract 5.16, line 1, the instructor's monologue reports on the elder's particular pronunciation as he has observed it, thus invoking her authority. He explains pronunciation as a dialect variation.

In extract 5.17, in line 3, the instructor extends the traditional IRE interaction pattern to report what the elder said; specifically, he again invokes her authority. After echoing the learner's translation, *door or road*, for the Halkomelem word *xalh* in line 3, the instructor then references his conversation with the elder that day in private elicitation

work. He elaborates and justifies the double gloss of *door or road* in turns 6 and 8. His interpretation is doubly justified, both as being the elder's choice and as acquired through privileged access.

In extract 5.18, the instructor qualifies his provisional analysis of the plural construction. Then, with *does that sound okay?* he explicitly selects the elder for a next turn to substantiate this analysis. This highly controlled, speaker-selects-next-speaker strategy is reflected in the precise answer, *yup*, from the elder in turn 2, after an extensive teacher monologue.

Extract 5.19 exemplifies another tightly controlled, teacher-fronted interactional routine. The teacher is calling for the spelling of single target language words. In response to a student's stated confusion in line 6 about vowel length in *chiyolh*, *I always get confused*, he does a justification of the incomplete state of knowledge about vowel length in the current linguistic literature. He justifies points of doubt with the call for more research, that is, specifically for more funded access to the elder. In line 7, he manages a swift change in focus from task-related talk to linguistic meta-talk or meta-justifications, with intonational or volume changes. At the end of a monologue on the need to research vowel length measurements, he uses lowered pitch and a 2 second pause to frame a justification of the need for a grant. A subsequent pitch raise prefaces a switch from a focus on doing a justification for vowel length research to a focus on doing the spelling task. This pitch cue indicates a change in turn-taking from monologic to interactive, specifically, to teacher prompts and students' self-selected answers. The pitch cue also indicates a turn-change, or TRP. The students recognize this switch by collectively self-selecting a turn in turn 8, and calling out the names of letters.

In 5.20, in a response to doubt about writing one of the spelling review words, the teacher continues to do a justification for the need for a grant. This time it is because the elders might sometimes say it one way and sometimes the other. In 5.21 he gives an interim morphological analysis. He justifies this analysis by seeking confirmation from the elder, who confirms it with *yup*.

5.4.4 Repair in doing a justification in Linguistics classes

In the following section, I describe how procedural talk is repaired within a context of doing a justification in the linguistics classes and with what kinds of language. Table 5.9 below summarizes the talk.

Table 5.9: Repair in doing a justification (partly using L2) in Linguistics classes.

Data set	Class	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
5.17 <i>this is for her</i>	February 18	O-I-O-R	Confirmation with qualification, citing elder (IRE)	Single L2 words & computer <i>bling</i>
5.18 <i>does that sound OK?</i>	February 18	S-I-O-R	Confirmation question and “yup” answer	Single word and clause in L2
5.19 <i>a big issue</i>	February 11	O-I-S-R	Incomplete response justified	Spelling letters & L1
	February 11	S-I-S-R	Meta-repair justifies further research	L1
5.20 <i>I wanna measure</i>	February 11	-S-R	Continued justification of interim answer & call for further research	L1
5.21 <i>right?</i>	February 11	S-I-O-R	Appeal to elder	particle
	February 11	S-I-S-R	Explicate problem	L2 verbal clause, single morphemes

In extract 5.17, the evaluation phase of this IRE interaction is reflected in a qualified repair in line 3. The teacher echoes the learner’s production, but then qualifies his approval by referring to his earlier interaction with the elder and to her specific use of the word. After the computer’s *bling* in line 5, the teacher begins an other-repair of the dual translation in line 6 with *could only have meant road there*.⁵¹ In line 8 he self-repairs this repair. A further *bling* of the computer completes this teacher-controlled interaction.

In extract 5.18, the elder confirms the linguist’s analysis. This repair was embedded within a lengthy turn. With *does that sound okay*, the instructor uses a self-initiated other-repair trajectory to justify his analysis. The elder’s *yup* in the next turn repairs the provisional nature of the instructor’s analysis. The instructor then echoes the elder’s *yup* and carries on his explication of plural construction options.

The interaction in extract 5.19 is again teacher-controlled within a format of teacher prompt and student response. However, when the student self-initiates a repairable in line 6, *I always get confused* (about whether to write a colon or not), the teacher justifies the student’s confusion. The teacher includes himself as sharing the

⁵¹ Elsewhere in the transcription, the instructor notes his unconscious tendency to hit the computer button as soon as someone answers, and compares it to a ouija board.

problem in line 7, *this is †this is a big problem*. The confusion is justified in terms of it being a larger research problem, which the teacher hopes to solve through a further grant proposal about vowel length.

In extract 5.20, the instructor continues his justification of an incomplete repair of the original question from extract 5.19, *is there a colon in chiyolh?* He justifies the need for further research again because *sometimes the elders might say it one way sometimes the other*.

Extract 5.21, partly repeated below as 5.21b, illustrates two repair types.

(5.21b) February 11, (Linguistics): Eliciting a justification: “yup”

1. T but (*Name*) is pretty clear this means **they** only had snow to drink.
 right (*Name*)?
2. E yup=
3. T they only had snow to drink. so it can't mean we; cuz it means
 they, (.0) um and this this wouldn't be they though. they would
 just be understood. um: (1) so we're still working on what that is.

In line 1, the linguist only calls on the elder to confirm his analysis. Her TCU is limited to *yup*. In line 3, the instructor then justifies the linguistic problem awaiting analysis: the pronoun marker for *they* would be a zero morpheme, whereas the verb in question has an *-em* suffix. The repair trajectory switches, or zigzags, from S-I-O-R to -S-R, reflecting control of the repair back to the linguist.

In summary, I find three basic repair strategies mobilized by the instructor/linguist to deal with interim, provisional knowledge.

5.4.4.1 Teacher references previous elicitation time with elder

In this strategy the instructor references his previous elicitation time with the elder. Examples are:

(5.6) in (*Name's*) dialect she says...

(5.7) I was talking to (*Name*) today

This S-I-S-R repair trajectory is enabled by privileged previous access. The linguist delivers news of his most recent work, which justifies the current analysis.

5.4.4.2 Teacher asks elder directly

In this strategy the instructor asks the elder directly. Examples are:

(5.8) *(Name)* does that sound okay?

(5.11) right *(Name)*?

This takes an S-I-O-R trajectory, in which the instructor does an elicitation. All participants witness the confirmation provided by the elder.

5.4.4.3 Teacher calls for more research

In this strategy the instructor calls for more research. Examples are:

(5.9) this is a big issue...

(5.10) that's why I wanna measure it

(5.11) we're working on it

This takes an S-I-S-R trajectory in a sort of meta-self repair. The linguist identifies the problem, elucidates its challenges or reports its interim solution, and determines what aspects of the language require further grant support.

5.4.5 Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in Linguistics classes

Interaction in the context of doing a justification in this class reflects two issues. They are common to any situation with few speakers and limited access. First, the learning problems in this context do not necessarily come from lack of individual effort, language learning skill, or general cognitive learning limitations. Often teachers have no answers (e.g., *we're still working on what that is*). There are few pedagogical grammars, few speakers, and limited funds to carry out research, especially with particular relevance to classroom learning. Access to elders' knowledge and to their voices for input is limited. This limited access is vulnerable to a host of political, historical, economic, health, and family issues, which most learners have little control over. However, learners and teachers must operate in classes with what provisional knowledge they have. This is seen by the teacher's constant qualifying of his current knowledge, *I hate to sound like I don't know too much about the language but I don't know if it's long or short*, and by his justifying the need for further research, *that's why I wanna measure it*. Lengthy analyses and justifications typically happen in English, considering

the limited ability of everyone other than the elder to operate outside fairly limited structures.

Second, this specific interactive pattern, of explaining target language examples in L1, while calling on the elder's voice primarily to justify the current linguistic analysis, leads to very little input from the present elder. Students have limited opportunity for negotiating meaning with a native speaker. This pedagogic stance treats the CD ROM as primary input and the elder as authoritative witness that the teacher 'has it right'. The teacher also has the practical advantage of spending time with the elder, which is not available to others who do not work for the language program.

This interactional dynamic situates the instructor as a gate-keeper between learners and the elder's linguistic knowledge. Such an interactive dynamic may not be avoidable. In this situation, the elder's advanced age, her health, and her limited hearing made it unfeasible for her to direct the class. Meanwhile, the students display many signs of being comfortable and pleased with the class; their laughter and acquiescence in all tasks seem to support this interactional pattern. However, given the limited access to the available resources, the interactional structure distances the learners from the elder and directs their interaction to the CD ROM as the more accessible voice.

5.5 Mentoring session and doing a justification

The mentoring data in a context of doing a justification are drawn from a mentoring session in the elder's home, as described in Section 3.2. In Section 5.5.1, I describe the language produced as the elder did a justification of home-based mentoring and also of one of the activities, telling traditional stories. In Section 5.5.2, I describe the data sets according to their interaction patterns. In Section 5.5.3, I discuss turn-taking aspects of the interaction, and in 5.5.4 its repair characteristics. In 5.5.5 I provide a brief discussion.

5.5.1 Language output doing a justification in a mentoring session

Table 5.10 below presents the target language output that focused on doing a justification in the mentoring session. The elder primarily directed her justification to me about why they were doing what they were doing.

Table 5.10: Total tokens of target language utterance types in doing a justification in mentoring:

Date	Speaker	e'e	name	formulaic	< 1 word	1 word	phrase	clausal/ 1 Verb
May 21,'05	elder	6	2			2		1
	SR	3		1	1	2	1	1

Whereas most task-related talk was in target language (not illustrated in this chapter), doing a justification was largely in English. Other than using people's Halkomelem names, and my one attempt to ask for a translation, the most frequent Halkomelem output was the affirmation token, *e'e*. Figure 5.4 shows the total types of target language utterances, according to complexity.

Figure 5.4: Types of target language utterances in doing a justification, Mentoring

<i>Elder</i>			
particle	e'e		yes
name	(Name)		
1 word	ste'a		same as
clause 1 verb	ste'a te lhimeh		same as us
<i>SR</i>			
particle	e'e		yes
1 word	ste'a		same as
phrase	te lhimeh		us
clause >1 verb	ewe te ste'a te a-álthe		not like me

5.5.2 Interaction in Mentoring in doing a justification: Data examples and description

Prior to extract 5.22, the elder and learner had been preparing a cake using the available ingredients in the elder's kitchen. The elder uses this task in this excerpt to do a justification of mentoring face to face in the home, in general.

attitude of families who do take part in traditional ritual activities through dreams and other ways. She affirmed that knowing traditional stories and believing they are true is an important part of knowing who you are.

This justification of the need to know the traditional stories of your own family was delivered mostly in English. Doing a justification functions to explain more fully the importance and relevance of the story telling aspect of the mentoring sessions to me, a non-speaker. The importance of knowing family stories is reiterated in extract 5.23 below.

(5.23) May 21, 2005, Mentoring: “you can’t deny who you are”

1. E it’s right to the present day
2. SR hm (1.5)
3. E yeah
4. S who you a:re (.8)
5. SR hm (1.9)
6. S ((coughs)) you can’t deny who you are
7. E ‘m’m (.8) ‘m’m (1.1)
8. S it’s sad though isn’t it.
9. E mhm? (1.8) a lot of our people do though cuz they don’t even know their own stories
10. S mhm (.9) mhm

The elder controls the justification of story-telling over 47 turns, supported by back-channelling from me and the student. Ten of those turns are excerpted in 5.23. First, the elder confirms in line 1 that these traditional stories still happen, *right to the present day*. The student links this knowledge to knowing who you are in her next two turns. After the elder agrees she and the elder orient to this justifying as a co-constructed reflection on the fact that *a lot of our people do though* (i.e., deny who they are) *cuz they don’t even know their own stories*. The interaction takes the form of a shared commitment

to ownership of traditional knowledge and a shared regret, however, that a lot of Aboriginal people do not know their own stories⁵².

Extract 5.24 illustrates a repair with a focus on form within the justification. The elder has just finished doing a telling about some wolf people who turn into regular people, just like *(Name)* and myself.

(5.24) May 21, 2005, (Mentoring): they're just like us

- | | | |
|--------|---|------------------|
| 1. E | [and they're just like | |
| 2. SR | [mhm, mhm, (.2) | |
| 3. E | like I said, (Name) and myself (.3) | (name) |
| 4. SR | hm (1.3) yeah (4.8) | |
| | <i>xwe'it kw'es thet-</i> (1.4) | how do you say, |
| | <they're like (2.2) they're like myself. (.5) | |
| | theyre li:ke us | |
| 5. E | <i>oh ste'á te lhimelh</i> | they are like us |
| 6. SR | -á | (li-) |
| 7. E | <i>ste'á::</i> | like |
| 8. SR | <i>ste'á::</i> | like |
| 9. E | <i>e'e</i> | yes |
| 10. SR | <i>te lhimelh, [e'e</i> | us, yes |
| 11. E | <i>[e'e e'e</i> | yes yes |
| 12. SR | <i>ewe te ste'á te a-álthe?</i> | (not like me) |
| 13. E | <i>ewéte</i> | there's nobody |
| 14. SR | <i>[ewete?</i> | (?) |
| 15. E | [you got no:: (.7) | |
| | you got no history at all? (.9) | |
| | from the people where you come from? (3.6) | |

⁵² This evokes the traditional notion (as recorded by Carlson, 2007, p. 159) that *smelálh* (worthy people) "know their history", whereas *st'éxem*, (low class people) "are considered to have forgotten their history."

Table 5.11: Turn-taking characteristics of doing a justification (using L2 or not) in mentoring

Data set	Class	Topic control	Sequence type	TCU content	TCU
5.22 <i>in a home setting</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	Fluid topic control by all participants	Examples co-constructed	Locally-managed	L1 co-constructed thru linked clauses
5.23 <i>you can't deny who you are</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	Elder controls	Point and corroborative point	Locally-managed	L1
5.24 <i>they're just like us</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	Joint control	Question-Answer	Locally-managed	L1-L2-L1

Overall in this context, turn-taking is controlled either by the elder or through co-constructed, locally-managed turns. Extract 5.22 illustrates the latter. The elder starts to itemize the advantages of mentoring at home in line 4, *we don't have to try and (.9) you know*, and the student finishes the turn in line 5 with *pack everything*. Both the pause in line 4, and the phrase *you know* invite the elder's co-present speaker to collaboratively provide the next syntactic chunk. I also join the co-constructed interactional pattern in line 9 by paraphrasing the previous point in support of mentoring at home. Our subsequent trio of *e'e-s* in lines 10 to 12 establishes our agreement on the shared evaluation.

Extract 5.23 illustrates another conversational pattern, with its open-ended structure, local management, and collaborative building of a shared perspective. This perspective is achieved through affirmative back channelling and repetitive phrases, *who you are* in line 4, echoed by *you can't deny who you are* in line 6. These are the normal strategies of establishing intersubjectivity used in everyday talk. Predictably, they are delivered in English.

In extract 5.24, the elder and I jointly develop the conversational topic. The turn-taking begins in lines 1 to 3 as jointly-established, open-ended, and locally-managed. At line 4, after a pause, I topic-switch to ask how to say the previous comment in Halkomelem. This switch initiates a pedagogical focus on form with a scaffolded production of some syntactic and phonological chunks, *ste'á:*, 'the same' and *te lhimilh*, 'us', from lines 5 to 11. After an attempted question and answer adjacency pair in lines 12 and 13, I display a failure in understanding in turn 14 (discussed in the section on repair, to follow). Although the focus changes from meaning, to one on form and then to

meaning, the turn-taking remains primarily locally-managed. The elder, however, takes a critical role in imparting and justifying vital cultural knowledge.

5.5.4 Repair in doing a justification in a mentoring session

Table 5.12 summarizes the talk using target language and English to do repair in a context of doing a justification in the mentoring session.

Table 5.12: Repair in doing a justification using L2 (or not) in a mentoring session

Data set	Class	Repair trajectory	Repair type	Language type
5.24, lines 5-6 <i>how do you say</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	S-I-O-R	Information question	Complex L2 clauses + L1
5.24, lines 7-10 <i>same as</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	O-I-O-R	Bald repair	L2 chunk
5.24, line 11 <i>us</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	O-I-S-R	Echoic	L2 chunk
5.24, lines 13-16 <i>not like me?</i>	Mentoring May 21, '05	S-I-O-R	Pragmatic	L2-L1

Extracts 5.22 and 5.23 do not include any examples of repair in doing a justification. However, extract 5.24 illustrates a variety of types of repair as I try to follow the implications of the elder's justification. She has just explained how her people come from the mountain goat people of Cheam. First, in line 4 I ask for a direct translation, using target language. Then in line 7, the elder scaffolds my first non-target attempt, with a bald correction. This repair moves through my echoed target production in line 8, her positive assessment in line 9, followed by my own self-repair in line 10 and then her positive evaluation in line 11. However, when I attempt to find out in line 12 if these goats could be like non-native people too, our mutual understanding flounders. The elder identifies a repairable by switching to English in line 15. However, instead of elaborating, I provide a demur, *well*, in line 16, leading to another repairable. Whatever my not knowing referred to, the elder interprets the problem as a lack of knowledge about my family history and follows this in line 17 and 19 by contrasting my experience

with her people, who try their best to hand down family history. I attend to her telling about her people, with back channels.

In summary, I found four different repair strategies in this context, although they all appeared in one interaction. They are summarized below as types, with examples drawn from excerpt 5.24.

5.5.4.1 Ask directly: how do you say X?

In this strategy someone asks directly *how do you say (X)*. An example is in line 4 of Excerpt 5.24:

xwe:it kw'es thet (X)	how do you say (X)
-----------------------	--------------------

A non-speaker asks how to translate a specific word or phrase from English into the target language. The target language phrase to request this direct translation had been elicited earlier.

5.5.4.2 Recast and echo production

In this strategy the elder recasts and the learner echoes. Examples are in lines 5 to 10 of Excerpt 5.24:

á	li- (a partial echo)
ste'á	like
te lhimelh	us

The examples are from a repair extended over several turns. The elder does a partial recast after my initial partial echo of her translation, *oh ste'á te lhimelh*, 'oh like us'. I then repeat that portion and echo the rest of the repair. This strategy allows the native speaker to scaffold production and the non-native speaker (me) to co-produce a repair.

5.5.4.3 Clarification question

This traditional repair strategy is a clarification question. An example is in line 12 of Extract 5.24:

ewe te ste'á te a-álthe?	not like me?
--------------------------	--------------

The question triggered a longer repair. This strategy proved unsuccessful, due to misunderstanding over the scope and (non-target) form of the negative construction. It also triggered a switch to English.

5.5.4.4 Demur/avoid

This strategy avoids the repair or withdraws from the repair. An example is in line 16 of Extract 5.24:

well I probly don't kno::w

Avoiding repair provides another option for abandoning the co-construction of meaning. However, the other speaker orients to it as an answer to the previous question.

Repair is locally-managed in the context of doing a justification in this mentoring session. The elder mostly other-repairs, except for my one attempt to anticipate the repair in line 10 of extract 5.24. The elder models target output when requested and uses a recast to repair a repairable.

5.5.5 Discussion: Interaction and doing a justification in a mentoring session

Although mentoring tasks were carried out mostly in target language, doing a justification was produced mostly in English. Perhaps also because some of the justifications involved sensitive and complex cultural information, doing a justification necessitated a shared non-target language. However, such understanding may support deeper appreciation of the meaning of the target language tellings of traditional stories and doings. Meanwhile, the echoic responses in target language reflected a traditional classroom type of repair strategy. The elder's bald repair, however, functioned to complete the repair efficiently and to expedite the continuing discussion.

In summary, the switch from one language to another reflected a switch in pedagogical focus. Specifically, doing a justification seemed to trigger a switch to L1 to facilitate a deeper understanding of pragmatic and protocol issues. This code-switching allowed interactants to exploit both available languages for different purposes. Certainly the intensive one-on-one interaction of the learner and elder in a mentoring context provided the learner with the maximum access to her linguistic, cultural and spiritual knowledge.

5.6 Discussion and conclusion: Turn-taking and repair in doing a justification

Doing a justification was delivered primarily in English in the LI classes, Linguistics classes, and in mentoring, and was delivered in Halkomelem and English in the LR classes. Several factors supported using non-target language: (a) greater length of utterances, (b) a need to set pragmatic constraints on repair, (c) a need for proper witnessing, and (d) a need to evaluate the significance of important cultural information. Doing a justification in non-target language supported tasks in target language later⁵³.

In the LR classes, doing a justification used the most complex target language when a student and the elder jointly constructed meaning with a focus on the form of a specific construction and a focus on meaning/pragmatics in excerpts 5.1 to 5.6 and 5.8 to 5.9. The focus on form was negotiated largely in target language; the focus on pragmatics was negotiated largely in L1. Because doing repair and achieving intersubjectivity is a potentially infinite task employed with very scarce resources, participants used their L1 in this context to establish a pragmatic threshold of appropriateness and suitability for repair. Extensive colloquial, open-ended work in their L1 enabled participants to strategically focus on appropriate language rather than on culturally or pragmatically absurd language.

In the LI classes, talk doing a justification was non-formulaic, extended, and focused on changing program goals. Its length and complexity fostered non-target language talk.

In the Linguistics classes, the elder justified the linguist's knowledge to the students and properly witnessed for the students and the linguist that the language was being appropriately re-constructed. This critical function constrained target language use, especially given the learners' degree of comprehension. Conversely, the elder's role as witness to the linguistic analysis supported the work of doing a justification in English.

In the Mentoring session, I was a witness to the work and also became the mentoree. The storytelling provided some culturally sensitive information and it behoove me to be appropriately informed about its significance. Telling the story was justified in terms of the potential loss of this knowledge to many young people within the

⁵³ Subsequent target-language tasks not included in these data were the speech rehearsal task, an immersion meal task, various jigsaw tasks and the choral chanting task in LI classes, an interview task and baking project in mentoring, and puppet show tasks in LR.

community and the importance of taking it very seriously, that is, believing it to be true. This job required fluency, and therefore was delivered in English.

Although procedural talk on setting up activities (discussed in Chapter 4) provided a relatively richer source of target language input and negotiation of meaning, the more complex issues addressed by doing a justification required more non-target language by teachers. It is presumably important for participants to understand why they are doing what they are doing, so some interaction in the L1 of everyone present seems unavoidable. Several other factors may motivate delivery in learners' L1. These include the need to witness and justify appropriate construction of the language, as well as the need to constrain repair and handle sensitive cultural issues.

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction

Several factors that contribute to the challenging context for teaching and learning Halkomelem are not under the control of learners or teachers. The historical-social-political legacy is that access to native speakers for input is now scarce and finite. Both linguists and communities seek access to these last speakers. Increasingly, the people teaching the language are also in the process of trying to learn it. Meanwhile, although many communities look to future immersion programs to deliver native speaker fluency, extensive research on Canadian immersion programs has shown that although many immersion programs record considerable success, immersion alone is not sufficient to develop native like proficiency in a second language (Fortune et al., 2008; Genesee, 1987; Swain, 1988). For example, Swain's 1985, study of teacher talk and student output in immersion classes (reported in Met, 2008, p. 65) found teachers spoke far more than students and "the limited output (words or brief phrases) generated by students contributes to the less-than-native-like productive skills of immersion students". Swain's research highlighted the importance of output as well as comprehensible input to developing second language proficiency. This finding reflects a dilemma, especially for Aboriginal communities, where both gaining language proficiency and maintaining use are seen as vital.

One factor that is amenable to direct manipulation by all participants is managing patterns of interaction. Increasingly, efforts at understanding second language learning cognitive processes have looked at the role of teacher feedback, teacher talk, and more generally, the co-construction of learning tasks through interaction as critical determinants of learning outcomes, in both regular and immersion classroom settings (see Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; for a fuller bibliography, Fortune et al., 2008). If interactional patterns can be seen to relate to language production, they offer teachers and learners a practical way to influence outcomes.

In this research, I have illustrated particular adaptations of classroom interactional patterns and shown how they enabled procedural talk and justified

classroom procedures. I have related these interactional choices to types of language utterances. As described earlier, I did not try to assess what was learned, but rather focused on what was spoken. I assume that the state of language use is an empirically accessible indicator of the current state of the language itself.

6.2 Summary of research findings

Most members of Aboriginal communities state their desire to either support or acquire conversational competence in an Aboriginal language. What is most often heard, however, is minimal target language use; specifically, of traditional names, familiar greetings, or 'yes' and 'no' in target language. In agreement with stated community goals of increasing spoken language beyond these tokens, it is important to ask how the desired greater fluency can be fostered. This research, with its examination of classroom interactive patterns as reflected in two different pedagogical foci, has provided some indication of the type and complexity of target language output currently supported and constrained by different interactional choices.

One finding is that participants have adapted some usual classroom interactional choices of turn-taking and repair to reflect the particular constraints and challenges of an endangered language context and to facilitate specific choices about using the available resources. The most obvious of these are interactional adaptations to the typical classroom patterns of IRE, teacher (procedural) monologues, and the usual power relations of the teacher to guide, correct and claim ownership over specialized knowledge about the language. In this context, the teacher may not know the language well, but unlike first language acquisition contexts, there is almost no one else who does. Consequently, consensus on what is provisionally target-like, or useable, has rested upon a co-present elder taking a critical role in the classroom process.

The architecture of that role has consequences for the amount, the source, and the type of target language produced. When the elder took a role of witness to the transmission of knowledge about the language and ratifier of that analysis by an expert instructor (i.e., was in a position of distal authority⁵⁴), learner TCUs were limited to translated words or letters⁵⁵. In contrast, when the elder worked in closer interaction

⁵⁴ I am indebted to Toohey (personal communication, July, 2008) who described this learning model as distal.

⁵⁵ The choice of a transmission model of interaction may reflect a traditional Aboriginal model of *proper witnessing*.

with learners, in a position of proximal authority (to extend Toohey's terminology), students' TCUs showed a shift to signs of emerging constructions (i.e., more complex output). The elder became a co-constructor with the learners in the re-construction of the language. The learners' access to scarce resources both reflected and also constructed differing rights to knowledge of all participants.

Another finding is that procedural confusions offered opportunities for the learners to nominate, negotiate and monitor procedures and tasks at varied levels of participation. A focus on real life problems, specifically, what to do next, entailed various interactive options: locally-managed turn-taking, open-ended repair trajectories and a quasi-conversational interactional pattern. Overall, setting up procedural tasks provided one resource for genuine or authentic interaction. Often the native speaker elder also took an active role in the task and in managing the language input, thus fostering direct interaction between learners and the primary language provider. In many instances, students co-constructed solutions to procedural problems in target language. Consequently, the talk in the context of a focus on procedure was conversation-like and focused on meaning, with only necessary queries for structural clarification when reaching intersubjectivity required it. In other words, it was ordinary everyday talk.

Within this context of procedural talk, turn-taking followed a more conversational pattern, whereas repair reflected the unequal distribution of ownership of linguistic knowledge in this context. Correspondingly, the interaction exemplified a unique adaptive form of institutional or goal-focused discourse. Specifically, target language complexity during procedural talk was facilitated by (a) procedural confusion, (b) extensive locally-managed practice, and (c) eventual learner monologues, (i.e., suspension of turn-taking in quasi-narratives). Because procedural talk presented real-life problems in a fairly constrained context, it supported goal-directed meaningful talk. This is what the communicative method calls authentic talk (Skehan, 1998, p. 183). Following Tomasello (2003), I assume that a shared focus on some relevant context is the primordial precursor to and motivator of language. By solving procedural problems together, speakers co-construct meaning and thereby continuously reconstruct language together.

In addition to the finding that procedural talk supports quasi-conversational target language interaction, I propose three provisos arising from these data. The first is that repair trajectories suggest that learners were not able to provide self-assessments or

repair, but that teachers were not always so privileged either. Whether learners could not or would not self-repair, the result was to rely on an elder as the sole authority for target language use. This tendency recalls the observation by Kroskrity (2009, p. 74) that what he termed *elder purism* “may place heritage languages more at risk by reducing the number of environments as well as the number of speakers in which and by whom they can be appropriately used”.

Second, the data support the value of basing language-learning activities on topics that are at the very least moderately relevant to learners and their individual or culturally situated lives. This may include what to do next procedurally. The language produced in a procedural context was more complex and more conversation-like than in drills, chanted echoic responses, or other less meaningful tasks. However, such complex output was enabled by ample preparatory work of more open-ended conversation-like interactive practice.

Third, there is a tipping point for an L2 switch to L1. Talk was relatively conversation-like on a focus on procedure. However, a possibly sensitive topic (e.g., talk in the jigsaw task about who does what housework) triggered a compelling need to speak authentically, to tell the truth and represent oneself as a responsible person. This necessitated a quick switch to English.

In summary, a strong interactional position sees language as constituted through the interactional patterns that sustain it. An interactional dynamic that places learners in direct communication with language bearers in mutual efforts to reach understanding about immediate and mutually relevant problems provides an interactional structure and a classroom-specific opportunity to support certain kinds of language use. An interactional dynamic that displaces learners from language bearers supports other kinds of language use. Choices in this everyday work of organizing people and tasks in language classrooms create the context for the kinds of situated actions within which both language and a language are constructed and re-constructed.

6.3 Other issues arising out of the data

In this section I discuss some issues that arose from the research. In particular, I examine the relation of my data to Seedhouse’s model, the use of L1 in this context, and the role of pragmatics. I also present some practical suggestions for language teachers.

6.3.1 A comparison with Seedhouse's model

The data in this research illustrate different patterns of teaching and learning in a focus on procedure and a focus on doing a justification than previously represented in Seedhouse's (2004) model of classroom interaction. Procedural talk provided an authentic opportunity for the co-construction of meaning on relevant and authentic topics in a language-learning context. Procedural talk was quasi-conversational and supported a variety of kinds of target language use. Doing a justification did not support as much talk in target language in most classes, except in one classroom where a student did a lengthy justification of her learning, but it served other purposes.

Although Seedhouse only discusses one aspect of procedural repair⁵⁶, my data identified several types of procedural repair. Learners asked the elder directly, echoed and asked clarification questions. The elder gave explicit negative evaluations and reformulated constructions. In doing repair of a student's own justification, the elder used mitigated repairs. Participants adapted the typical classroom self-initiated other-repair trajectory to a self or other-initiated-(Elder-confirmed)-other-repair in this context. This adaptation allowed participants to authorize repair through a jointly scaffolded repair trajectory, reflecting a context of fluid roles and varied rights to ownership of knowledge about the language.

6.3.2 The role of pragmatics

Data from the LR class showed how some use of L1 functioned to constrain the potentially unlimited work of repair for the one native speaker available to model and repair the language for all learners. The work of repair had to meet a pragmatic threshold of appropriateness. Whether the learner was using a nominalized clause in target-like construction or not, the construction was not 'worth' fixing if it did not make sense once fixed. There is a cost to repair and pragmatics helps to set it.

In addition, though, pragmatic confusion over meaning provided a trigger for more complex language. Overall, pragmatics in the form of the authentic and contextualized business of establishing procedure and doing procedural repair presented everyone involved with real problems. This required real-life language to solve. Consequently, procedural problems and pragmatic misunderstandings provided some of the most authentic and conversational contexts for use of Halkomelem. One

⁵⁶ Seedhouse notes a different preference structure for procedural repair of "bald *nos* in conjunction with other-initiated other-repair" (2004, p. 173).

implication is that even with non-fluent teachers where roles are uncertain and everyone is forced to learn together, there are still opportunities for conversation-like genuine interaction in the target language. Out of crisis can come new opportunities.

6.3.3 The role of L1

Although talk in L1 is often dismissed as a waste of classroom time by approaches such as the Direct Method (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 23), strategic use of L1 was a resource in a context where almost no one spoke the language fluently. A switch to L1 was not productive of target language when the conversational focus became too rivetingly interesting or authentic (in the jigsaw activity) and the previous target language relapsed into L1. However, in other situations, the L1 provided a strategic resource. One instructor used English extensively to justify a switch in the program focus from written to oral speaking. English was used as an alternative strategy in the traditional story telling to support a learning context that would not otherwise have been available. The dilemma of establishing a pragmatic threshold for repair was finally solved in English. Expedient, timely and judicious use of their L1 helped interactants achieve intersubjectivity and get on with what they were doing. It also helped to constrain and pace the work of the elder. Finally, judicious use of L1 contributed a wealth of cultural and spiritual input to the work of reconstructing the business of being an Aboriginal person from this community and speaking Halkomelem with a shared, and provisional, understanding. However, because English use does not directly support Halkomelem language fluency, this only heightens the importance of exploiting other opportunities to negotiate meaning in target language. For example, work by Hinton (2003) and Holm, Silentman and Wallace (2003) provide simple, practical and workable teaching strategies for non-fluent teachers to manage their classroom talk in target language.

6.3.4 Practical teaching strategies

Five strategies emerged from these data that specifically fostered target language utterance production. These strategies are listed below.

Teaching strategies to foster target language production

- (a) offering a syntactic bait
- (b) switching to target language at a TRP
- (c) echoing a question, not answering it
- (d) talking about oneself (for learners)
- (e) preparing and doing monologues, given sufficient input and rehearsal (for learners)

The first three strategies fit within an approach that accepts language as constantly evolving and sees the process of language construction as dynamic and incontrovertibly interactive. First, framing a syntactic constituent to trigger next-speaker completion at a TRP, or what I termed ‘taking the syntactic bait’, functioned to switch speaker turns and to trigger the syntactic completion in the next turn (as discussed in Sections 4.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.1).

Second, evidence from the mentoring data that whichever language is used at a TPR triggers the same language response suggests that this is a pedagogically sensitive point for increasing target language production. Although participants may struggle with lexical gaps and target language failures of repair, strategic use of L1 may bridge these problems and allow interaction to proceed in a reasonably expeditious fashion. If interaction, though, were too expeditious and efficient, everyone would use their L1s. So, it may be critical to ensure check-points to redirect interaction to target language. As a TRP was a trigger point for the specific following language choice (whether L1 or target), using the target language at Turn-Relevance-Places provides a practical teaching strategy for teachers to increase target language output. Priming target language use even at the end of a TCU appears to help support target language next turns.

Third, in a subtype of the previous strategy, echoing a target language question in the previous turn framed the next turn in target language talk. Extract 4.9 exemplified this strategy.

The fourth strategy exemplifies a principle that topics for target language use have to matter to participants. The most complex language was supported in all cases where participants were talking about themselves and each other, including the one example of doing a justification in mostly target language. This involved quite concrete and everyday talk: interviewing each other and reporting what people did that morning

before coming to school. This insight supports the communicative teaching perspective that classroom talk should be relevant to learners (but not overwhelm students' target language ability).

The fifth strategy, the use of learner monologues in learner utterances, supported an increase in both fluency and complexity of learner utterances. This may reflect the critical role of frequency in supporting spoken language use. As Swain and Lapkin (2008, p. 130) discovered, "repetition (through multitask activities) created opportunities to learn new lexical items and consolidate their knowledge of known ones in a natural manner." Two weeks of preparation with locally-managed, open-ended, personally relevant, quasi-conversational work involving both copious input and adequate rehearsal, fostered familiarity with the topic and functional constructions, as well as allowing time to construct more complex talk.

The findings of this research indicate the relevance of all these factors to making practical contributions in maintaining and supporting target language use in an endangered context. These factors include: (a) the frequency effects of input, (b) talk that is situated in real-life work and (c) interactional patterns that foster a strategic management of turn-taking and repair.

6.4 Postscript: Some implications for Halkomelem, its learners, linguists and communities

The following section reflects some of my experiences and observations during the research process. I finish this work with some practical suggestions.

6.4.1 Program choices

The state of Halkomelem will continue to depend on interactional and pedagogical choices made within the program. Community choices about access to very scarce resources will ultimately play an important role.

It is obviously increasingly difficult to foster face-to-face interaction between learners and speakers, although there have been attempts to support web-conferencing with one fluent speaker. These activities could be balanced by increased attention to

some more interactive activities both among learners, and between learners and the remaining speakers⁵⁷.

A recent program focus has been on producing CD ROMs of stories, as seen in the data. This decision may provide a contextualized form of the language and prove useful for a variety of future learning contexts. As Steven Point (2008), the Lieutenant-Governor and elder said, with respect to inspiring young people:

“They are inspired by stories. They like to hear stories, they just do...They’re captivated by stories, I think. I think we lost a lot of the translation when we just watch TV. We don’t have to be involved in it. But when you tell somebody a story, you’ve got to look at them and you’ve got to talk to them and they get engaged in the process. And their imagination gets moving. Something happens. And they begin to see the story through their mind. I think that’s much more engaging. I find it’s a very good way to connect with young people”

Although the proficiency of the linguist was noteworthy at the time of research, the spontaneous language output of most others was overall quite minimal. However, one post-research observation is that a group of these learners have become, four years later, considerably more proficient. They are currently all teaching the language in some capacity. This suggests that an opportunity even for self-input of target language, along with the kind of focus on form necessary to present language material to others, can support developing new speakers of the language.

6.4.2 The role of linguists and linguistics

It is my personal observation that many language teachers, particularly in the field of endangered languages, have retreated from a study of linguistics and its theoretical focus on generative syntax. Many papers from Reyhner’s and Lockhard’s 14th and 15th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conferences (Reyhner & Lockard, 2009) reflect the problematic relationship between academic linguists and communities working to revive Aboriginal languages. In his summary of Speas (2008), Reyhner (2008, p. vi) raises the dilemma of whether linguists are relevant at all to language revitalization work “given the often divergent goals of linguists and communities.” Both Speas (2008) and Grenoble (2008) argue that linguists are not actually trained to produce

⁵⁷ The particular focus-on-form format of the Linguistics class, however, could complement learners in making use of more direct interactional opportunities later, in an ‘instructional counterbalance’ as proposed by Lyster and Mori (2008).

what communities need: specifically, children's books, teaching materials, text books, dictionaries or even orthographies. Whether this claim reflects the inadequacies of all fields within linguistics or not, certainly a mismatch in goals between both sides of the academic research and classroom practice partnership has created something of a vacuum in the classroom, leaving a shopping list of methods and attendant gurus that may be supported by minimal research.

In contrast, the sub-field of sociolinguistics has documented the situation more empirically. However, within this perspective, work with communities is often couched in a somewhat cataclysmic rhetoric of revitalization. The assumption that if a language is not learned as a first language it is first moribund and then dead, or extinct (Fishman, 1991, Drapeau, 1995), frames the work as a salvage operation, of something currently disappearing from its original perfect state to a diminished reclaimed state⁵⁸. The parallel with extinction of species is compelling. The whole language planning or revitalizing languages field predicates a life and death image for languages, with attendant images of murder or linguicide (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

This may not be the most helpful image. For example, Reid's (1984, p. 59) review of Haugen, McClure and Thomson (1981) suggested some appreciation for the function of code-switching as a "corrective to (a) somewhat apocalyptic view" of the decline of Celtic languages⁵⁹. An alternative exists in a more celebratory attitude to multilingualism and its attendant interactional choices in the linguistic repertoire of communities.

Perhaps linguists (and sociolinguists) could focus less on proclaiming the imminent death of Aboriginal languages and focus more on just speaking them; less on saving Halkomelem and more on learning Halkomelem. As linguists working with Aboriginal communities, maybe we should go back to the business of finding out how people learn languages, in cooperation with other researchers finding out how people learn, and then bring our special understanding of the structures of languages and skills in documenting them, and set about devising practical applications to assist people in learning.

⁵⁸ Miller (2007, p. 2) and Carlson (2007, p. 139) also refer to the salvage (ethnographic) paradigm.

⁵⁹ This was in the context of seeing any evidence of non-target language use as evidence of language decline. Carlson (2007, p. 139) also argued for examining dynamic shifts *within* indigenous societies in response to outside forces, versus focusing only on a model of disaster, loss and assimilation.

6.4.3 Future possibilities

Some practical work remaining to be done includes: (a) identifying the functional uses of constructions and situating these within culturally appropriate and personally relevant contexts of meaning (disembodied rules will not foster fluency any more than disembodied drills); and (b) creating small do-able activities involving learners with a variety of interesting and typical constructions. These may include stories with repetitive situations that recycle these constructions, oral story telling, plays, songs, and rehearsed speech-making, supported by some brief focus on forms of specific constructions to maximize opportunities for frequency of input and contextualized practice. For example, Mellow (personal communication, April 12, 2009) has worked with Maria Myers, an instructor and native speaker of Tsilhqut'in, to identify constructions in Tsilhqut'in and model this approach. The work that Ignace (personal communication, April 9, 2009) has done developing a counting book to focus on shape classifiers in Haida (Xaad Kil), as well as my own work getting adult learners to produce children's pop-up books in a variety of Aboriginal languages suggest practical ways to contextualize language learning through stories.

Further specific teaching techniques and activities to support this work could include (a) the Language Experience Approach (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 143); (b) TPR Storytelling (Ray & Seely, 2005); (c) project-based learning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, Skehan, 1998); (d) tasks to support quasi-conversational talk; (e) exploiting opportunities for communication about procedural issues in classrooms, as well as (f) preparation of ritual and ceremonial talk. Topics (a) to (f) are described below. I provide some examples from my own experience with project-based learning and teaching subsequent to the time of this research.

The Language Experience Approach teaches (adult) literacy through getting adults to write and read about their own experiences in their own words. This helps to create new and relevant reading materials. In cooperation with fluent speakers where available, this approach could provide relevant and memorable teaching materials to learners at various levels.

The techniques developed by practitioners of TPR Storytelling provide a series of focused and contextualized questions of the grammatical relations (subject, object, predicate, oblique phrases) in every statement of a simple story. This fosters interactive, but structured and language-focused classroom talk. The main advantage is providing an opportunity for a focus on form within a comprehensible and entertaining context,

with maximum frequency of the input forms. This technique is probably most useful at the early stages of gaining language proficiency.

Project-based learning on culturally and locally appropriate topics could provide a wealth of contextually-situated language constructions and relevant experiences in the language. For example, in consultation with adult learners, I had an opportunity to co-develop a number of linguistics courses through locally-developed small projects. These have included: (a) teaching linguistics through working with wool, in which we discovered and analyzed target language structures after developing a curriculum project to pick, wash, card, spin, dye, and weave with local wool; (b) learning linguistic structures through writing brochures for band health clinics on the signs of a heart attack, signs of choking, and hospital admitting procedures (in Tsilhqut'in/Chilcotin and Secwepemctsin/Shuswap); and (c) analyzing linguistic structures through getting airplane in-flight safety instructions translated, recorded, and performed in an Aboriginal language. The third project culminated in negotiations with an airline and succeeded in getting the safety instructions in the Aboriginal language on flights in and out of Bella Bella. All these projects provided some opportunities for contextualized and relevant language use as well as focused opportunities to learn it.

The even more interactive and needs-based activities of programs for new immigrants are probably not appropriate for the level of proficiency and opportunities for contextualized use in endangered language classrooms. 'Discussions that work' on political or social issues (Ur, 1987), for example, will in fact not work where almost no one speaks the language fluently, including the teacher. This does not mean that classes cannot be communicative, but that how and when they are communicative may vary from other classrooms. For example, these data show how reversing the order of pedagogical activities from meaning-focused and more highly interactional to later performed monologues by learners was helpful in supporting fluent language production. Although it is counter-intuitive to a traditional approach (to focus on form, then practice, and then allowing freer creative expression), in this context the freer interactive style of the practice session may have fostered greater input frequency of forms in a meaningful context, to the point where they became closer to grammaticalized. This sequencing allowed the learners to produce more extensive monologues using quite complex constructions in the form of culturally appropriate speeches or oral reports. So, providing at least quasi-conversational opportunities, based

on learners talking about their own lives and experiences, is seen in this research to help foster more complex target language utterances.

Classes may be relatively communicative in such contexts as a focus on procedure. Classroom procedures already provide a realistic and authentic context for meaningful talk in classrooms and could be exploited further. In other contexts, interaction in L1 may facilitate later target language fluency or sharing important cultural knowledge.

Another realistic goal is to support the development of a new generation of people who can function in the very active ceremonial and cultural work already happening in rebuilding and supporting healthy communities. The most complex and extended talk that happens in student monologues and speech making provided a culturally appropriate and linguistically fruitful context for extending that use. Quasi-conversational talk, focused practice, and interactive dialogues in classrooms all help facilitate appropriate fluency for speech making. This fits within an approach that sees language learning as situated, or rooted in, social practices.

Meanwhile, it will be important to develop forms of assessment that support stated community and learner goals. Clear assessment measures of fluency based on interactive practices can help inform curricular choices and program planning. Although the term 'best practices', borrowed from the discourse of health care is much in vogue, it may be useful to supplement that with the notion of 'evidence-based practices', another term borrowed from health care. Assessment should reflect actual classroom practices and evidence about the language being spoken there as a result.

Most useful will be to get on with developing learning activities for practical classroom use that will provide sufficient input, appropriate form focus and lots of meaningful interaction. All this implies sharing the time of elders strategically between the needs of academic research and the urgent curricular needs of communities.

Finally, it is important to celebrate people's ability to access a variety of linguistic styles, registers, and languages to enrich their lives, enable their activities and interact with others. Each language adds to those opportunities and is constructed and reconstructed out of those opportunities.

Halkomelem is far from dying. When it is spoken it lives. People are talking, dreaming, misunderstanding each other and coming to mutual understandings in Halkomelem. They are doing cultural work - marrying, burying, birthing, honouring,

celebrating and grieving - in Halkomelem and other Aboriginal languages every day.
For outside linguists, funding agencies, bands, and communities, it is time to get to work
in all our various ways and trades to support all these ways of talking in Halkomelem.

Ilhe nem' cet yó:yes.

REFERENCE LIST

- Assembly of First Nations, (1990). *Towards linguistic justice for First Nations*. Assembly of First Nations Education Secretariat, Ottawa.
- Assembly of First Nations, (1992). *Towards rebirth of First Nations languages*. Assembly of First Nations Education Secretariat, Ottawa.
- Allen, S.E.M., & Crago, M.B. (1996). Early passive acquisition in Inuktitut. *Journal of Child Language*, 23, 129-155.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, B. (2007). Summary of qwi : qwi : diΔΔa q (Makah) attitudinal study. *UBCWPL. Papers for the ICSNL XLII, Volume 20*, 1-27.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness, some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G. (1991). Introduction: Ethnomethodology and the foundational respecification of the human sciences. In G. Button (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the human sciences* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, J. L., & Hopper, P. (2001). Introduction. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure* (pp. 1-26). Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA : John Benjamin Publishing.
- Bygate, M. (1988). Units of oral expression and language learning in small group interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 59-82.
- Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*, vol. 3. Ottawa ON, CCG Publications.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1), 1-47.
- Carlson, K. T. (2007). Towards an indigenous historiography: Events, migrations, and the formation of "post-contact" Coast Salish collective identities. In B. G. Miller (Ed.), *Be of good mind. Essays on the Coast Salish* (pp. 138-181). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Clarke, A. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Cook, E.-D. (1998). Aboriginal languages: A history. In J. Edwards (Ed.), *Language in Canada* (pp. 125-143). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting M. (2001). Introducing interactional linguistics. In M. Selting and E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 1-22). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dicker, J., Dunbar, E., & Johns, A. (2009). Developing intermediate language learning materials: A Labrador Inuttitut story database. In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance & lessons learned*, 155-166. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 453-464.
- Drapeau, L. (1995). Perspectives on Aboriginal language conservation and revitalization in Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Research report. Ottawa, On., CCG Publications.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Duff, P. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Taking task to task. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Dunn, W. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's i+1: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language Learning*, 48, 411-442.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form focused instruction and second language learning* (pp. 1-46). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ellis, N. (2003). Constructions, chunking, and connectionism: The emergence of second language structure. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 63-101). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. F. (1991). *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ford, C. E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 134-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fortune, T.W., Tedick D., & Walker, C.L. (2008). Integrated language and content teaching: insights from the immersion classroom. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism, evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 71-96). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Galloway, B. D. (1980). *Tó:lméls ye siyelyólexwa. Wisdom of the elders. The structure of Upriver Halkomelem, a grammatical sketch and classified word list for Upriver Halkomelem* (by Coqualeetza elders group, the Stalo Heritage Project Elders Group, the Halkomelem Workshop of the Nooksack Tribe and Brent Galloway). Sardis, B.C.; Coqualeetza Education training Centre.
- Galloway, B. D. (1993). *A grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gerdts, D. B., & Hinkson, M. Q. (1996). Salish lexical suffixes: A case of decategorialization. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language* (pp. 163-175). Stanford: CSLI.
- Grenoble, L. A. (2009). Linguistic cages and the limits of linguists. In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous Language Revitalization, Encouragement, Guidance and Lessons Learned* (pp. 61-69). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Hall, J. K., Cheng, A., & Carlson, M. T. (2006). Reconceptualizing multicompetence as a theory of knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 220-240.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J.M. (1984). Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinton, L. (2001a). Language revitalization: An overview. In L. Hinton & K.Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 3-18). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hinton, L. (2001b). The master-apprentice language learning program. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 217-226). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hinton, L., Vera, M., & Steele, N. (2002). *How to keep your language alive: A commonsense approach to one-on-one language learning*. Heyday Books, Berkeley, California.
- Hinton, L. (2003). How to teach when the teacher isn't fluent. In J.Reyhner, O. Trujillo, R.L. Carrasco & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing Native languages* (pp. 79-92). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. Retrieved 6/10/09 at http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/NNL/NNL_6.pdf.

- Hinkson, M. (1999). *Salishan lexical suffixes: A study in the conceptualization of space*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Holm, W., Silentman, I., & Wallace, L. (2003). Situational Navajo: A schoolbased, verb-centered way of teaching Navajo. In J. Reyhner, O. Trujillo, R.L. Carrasco & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing Native languages* (pp.25-52). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. Retrieved 6/10/09 at http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/NNL/NNL_3.pdf.
- Hopper, P. (1987). Emergent grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 155-76.
- Hymes, D. (1974). Ways of speaking. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 433-451). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ignace, M. (1998). *Handbook for Aboriginal language program planning in British Columbia. A report prepared for the First Nations Steering Committee, Aboriginal language sub-committee, FNESC, March 1998*. Vancouver: FNESC.
- Johnson, K. (1984). *Communicative syllabus design and methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Jonassen, D. H. (2000). Revisiting activity theory. In D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (Eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Jonassen, D. H., & Land, S.M. (2000). Preface. In D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (Eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Kinkade, D. M. (1991). The decline of native languages in Canada. In R.H. Robbins & E.M. Uhlenbeck (Eds.), *Endangered languages* (pp. 157-176). New York: Berg.
- Kozulin, A (2003). Psychological tools and mediated learning. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Agayev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 15-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell T. (1983). *The Natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language*, 68, 1, 4-10.
- Krauss, M. (1997). The indigenous languages of the north: A report on their present state. In H. Shoji & J. Jinhunen (Eds.), *Northern minority languages: Problems of survival. Senri Ethnological Studies 44* (pp. 1-34). Osaka, Japan: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Kroeber, P. D. (1999). *The Salish language family*. Lincoln and London, University of Nebraska Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2009). Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle: the need for "Ideological Clarification". In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (eds.). *Indigenous*

- language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance & lessons learned*, 71-83. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Kuipers, A. H. (1974). *The Shuswap language: Grammar, texts, dictionary*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leontyev, A. N. (1981). *Problems of the development of the mind*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Levinson, S. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linghtbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (1997). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. (1983). Inside the "black box." In H. W. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 3-36). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M.H., & Sato C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teacher's questions. In H.W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M.H., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-28.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2008). Instructional counterbalance in immersion pedagogy. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism, evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 133-151). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd..
- Mahn, H. (2003). Periods in child development: Vygotsky's perspective. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Agayev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 119-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Malinowsky, B. (1945/1961). *The dynamics of culture change. An inquiry into race relations in Africa*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mellow, J. D. (2008). The emergence of complex syntax: A longitudinal case study of the ESL development of dependency resolution. *Lingua*, 118, 4, 499-521.

- Met, M. (2008). Paying attention to language: Literacy, language and academic achievement. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism, evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 49-70). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd..
- Miller, B. G. (2007). Introduction: In B. G. Miller (Ed.), *Be of good mind: Essays on the Coast Salish* (pp. 1-29). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Miller, S. M. (2003). How literature discussion shapes thinking: ZPDs for teaching/learning habits of the heart and mind. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Agayev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 289-316). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, M. (2001). *The languages of native North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501-518.
- Nofsinger, R. E. (1991). *Everyday conversation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, 41(2), 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1999). Transcription as theory. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 166-178). New York, Routledge.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning, conditions, processes, outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Pike, K. L. (1964). *Language in relation to a unified theory of structures of human behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Point, S. (2008). Lieutenant-governor hopes to inspire youth, *Vancouver Sun*, Saturday February 9, 2008.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second-language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversational analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pye, C. (1992). Language loss among the Chilcotin. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 93, 75-86.
- Pye, C., & Quixtan Poz, P. (1988). Precocious passives and antipassives in Quiche Mayan. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development* 27, 71-80.
- Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2005). *Fluency through TPR Storytelling*. Berkeley, CA: Command Performance Language Institute.
- Rehyner, J. (2009). Introduction. In J. Rehyner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned* (pp. v-viii). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, E. (1984). [Review of the book: *Minority language today*]. *Applied Linguistics* 5(1), 58-61.
- Rumelhart, D. E., & McClelland, J. L. (1986). On learning the past tenses of English verbs. In J. L. McClelland & D. E. Rumelhart (Eds.), *Parallel distributed processing: Exploration in the microstructure of cognition, Vol 2, Psychological and biological models* (pp. 216-71). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press/Bradford.
- Sacks, H. (1984). On doing "begin ordinary". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413-429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vol.s 1-2). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Saeed, J. I. (1997). *Semantics*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Savignon, S. (1972). *Communicative competence: an experiment in foreign-language teaching*. Philadlphia, Pa.: Centre for curriculum development.
- Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice*. Reading, Massachusets: Addison-Wesley.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff, & S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 1-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1997). Combining form and meaning. *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 336-344.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Sodergard, M. (2008). Teacher strategies for second language production in immersion kindergarten in Finland. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism, evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 152-173). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Speas, M. (2009). Someone else's language: On the role of linguists in language revitalization. In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous Language*

- Revitalization, Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned* (pp. 23-36). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Suttles, W. (2004). *Musqueam reference grammar*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Swain, M. (1988). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury house.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2008). Lexical learning through a multitask activity: The role of repetition. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism, evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp.119-132). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Turnbull, W. (2003). *Language in action: Psychological models of conversation*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Turnbull, W., & Carpendale, J.I.M. (1999). A social pragmatic model of talk: Implications for research on the development of children's social understanding. *Human Development*, 42, 328-355.
- Ur, P. (1987). *Discussions that work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urbanczyk, S. (2001, August). *A bit about ablaut in Upriver Halkomelem*. Paper presented at the 36th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, Chilliwack.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman.
- Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-89.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), *L. S. Vygotsky, Collected Works, Vol. 1* (pp. 39-285). New York: Plenum.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). A sociocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 85-100). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2000). Vygotsky's two minds on the nature of meaning. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 19-29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, F. (2004). Linguistic strategies encountered at a Haida immersion camp. *UBC Working Papers in Linguistics, 39th ICSNL, Vol. 14*, 403-418.