Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions:

Incongruent interrogative practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction

Fredrik Rusk*

Faculty of Education and Arts, Nord university, Universitetsalléen 11, 8026

Bodø, Norway, fredrik.k.rusk@nord.no

Fritjof Sahlström

Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki, Siltavuorenpenger 5 A, 00014 Helsinki,

Finland, fritjof.sahlstrom@helsinki.fi

Michaela Pörn

Faculty of Education and Welfare Studies, Åbo Akademi University, Rantakatu 2, 65100 Vaasa,

Finland, michaela.poern@abo.fi

*Corresponding author. Email: fredrik.k.rusk@nord.no

Initiating and carrying out L2 instruction by asking known-answer questions: Incongruent interrogative practices in bi- and multilingual peer interaction

ABSTRACT

Conversation analytic (CA) studies on second language (L2) learning show that known-answer questions posed by teachers form an integral part of the social interaction in L2 classrooms. However, studies on peers asking known-answer questions of each other when orienting to L2 learning have not been conducted. Focusing on L2 learning as social action, and using the CA framework of epistemics in interaction, this study investigates how peers use known-answer questions as interactional practices in L2 learning. In the epistemic framework, known-answer questions can be called incongruent interrogatives; the results show that they appear to initiate instructional sequences and propose epistemically asymmetric positions when peers engage in the joint activity of L2 learning. This study demonstrates that peers are capable of doing L2 learning and illustrates the need to provide students with the opportunity, and responsibility, to do L2 learning with each other.

1. Introduction

Classroom research, including conversation analytic (CA) studies in second language (L2) classrooms, has shown that teachers commonly ask questions on topics that lie more generally within their domain of expertise, or to which they already know the answer. These questions, called known-answer questions, exam questions, display questions, or as, for example, the initiation in some Initiation, Response, Evaluation (IRE) sequences, have been extensively studied and analyzed (e.g., Hargreaves, 2012; Lee, 2007, 2010; Long & Sato, 1983; MacBeth, 2003; Margutti, 2006, 2010; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Radford, Blatchford, & Webster, 2011; Searle, 1969; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Waring, 2012, and many others). Previous research indicates that a teacher may ask a known-answer question for several reasons: for example, to evaluate the students' understanding and learning or to make the students display knowledge that they have previously learned. CA studies on questions that appear to ask for something that the speaker already knows (or is within the speaker's epistemic domain) usually employ the analytical apparatus of analyzing repair practices–although known-answer questions are not always associated with doing repair in the classroom (e.g., Hellermann, 2009; Kasper, 2009; Kääntä, 2010; Macbeth, 2004; Markee, 2000; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong, 2000). Nevertheless, to date, most CA studies investigating, for example, known-answer questions employ the analytical framework for repair—practices through which the ongoing activity is interrupted to attend to trouble(s) or problem(s) in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. Repair is used by participants in interaction to maintain and/or restore intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002). Some studies on repair practices in L2 classrooms distinguish between repair and correction (for a thorough review of this issue, see, e.g., Kääntä, 2010, or MacBeth, 2004).[1] However, several scholars have

problematized this view of repair and correction in L2 educational settings (e.g., Hall, 2007; Koshik, 2002; Seedhouse, 2007). There appear to be two approaches to the issue (Seedhouse, 2007). One approach is etic, that is, uses a ready-made definition of repair and correction in the analysis. The other approach advocates an emic perspective on the practices. This study employs an emic perspective and approaches these meaning-making practices in-and-through the epistemics framework (Heritage, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d).

The extensive body of research on repair practices and L2 learning in L2 classrooms (Hellermann, 2009; Kääntä, 2010; MacBeth, 2004; Markee, 2004; Markee & Kasper, 2004; McHoul, 1990; Mori, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004) shows that repair practices and known-answer questions appear to be intrinsic parts of talk-in-interaction in pedagogical institutions and learning contexts, such as the L2 classroom. Almost all research on known-answer questions, within and beyond the field of research on L2 learning, has focused on teachers. However, in line with a redefinition of learning as situated in social situations and contexts, the importance, in research and in practice of learning in peer-to-peer interaction has increased. This importance is also reflected in the vast field of research on the subject (Back, 2016; Donato, 1994; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Pyle, Pyle, Lignugaris/Kraft, Duran, & Akers, 2016; Topping, 2005). Therefore, there is a growing need for a better understanding of the specific, locally situated practices in peer-to-peer interaction that afford learning.

There is a considerable body of research on peers' interactions and L2 learning. For example, peers involved in L2 learning and instruction have been shown to orient to and co-construct roles as the L2 teacher and the L2 learner (Lilja, 2014). Peers also employ similar interactional resources for doing L2 learning in social interaction, as is common in student–teacher interaction (e.g., Jakonen, 2014a, 2014b; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Sahlström et al., 2013; Slotte-Lüttge, Pörn, & Sahlström, 2012), and in forms of language play that are similar to

form-focused language drills and L2 teaching activities (Čekaite, 2006; Melander, 2012; Sahlström, 2011). Regarding peers' use of known-answer questions, Evaldsson and Sahlström (2014) showed how peers often seem to orient to questions about lexical terms as known-answer questions. Questions regarding word knowledge are often oriented to as a practice for teasing the recipient and exposing the recipient's lack of knowledge. However, within this body of research, there is still room to expand the understanding of how specific practices in their locally situated contexts appear to afford learning in peer-to-peer situations. For example, studies on how peers use known-answer questions as part of L2 learning and instruction have not been conducted.

There is a rich body of literature on known-answer questions in teaching. Thus, this article does not describe and document a new interactional practice per se. Instead, the purpose of this article is to locate, describe, and gain new understanding of how known-answer questions are part of, and contribute to, how learning situations emerge in *peer* interaction. This article aims to contribute new knowledge of peers' use of known-answer questions regarding L2 knowledge by using a CA perspective on doing L2 learning as social action and employing Heritage's (2012b, 2012c, 2012d) notions of epistemic status, stance, and the management of epistemic congruence.

1.2 CA and learning

CA has not been used historically in studies on learning in social interaction (Gardner, 2012). The primary interest of traditional CA studies is the organization of the embodiment of human sociality from an emic participant's perspective (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1996). The organization of talk-in-interaction is considered to be constituted by participants' ongoing sense-making practices. CA is based on systematically established empirical findings situated in naturally occurring settings, which means that the analysis is built on categories, actions, and activities that participants make relevant and co-construct in their situated interactions (Schegloff, 1996, 2007). One of the foundational resources for the emic CA analysis

is what has come to be called the next-turn proof procedure (Sacks & Schegloff, 1974, pp. 728–729). A series of turns can be tracked for what participants may be doing through the turns, which responses may be relevant or possible, and where the sequence is going. In other words, what outcomes do the participants pursue? Every interactional contribution (e.g., turn, utterance) is situated in the context, is shaped by the context, and renews the context (Seedhouse, 2004). CA and its emic perspective on social interaction provide tools for analyzing how participants understand and orient to aspects of their situated social practices as learning practices.

1.2 L2 learning as social action

A social-interactional perspective on L2 learning has been firmly established over the last 20 years or so. Despite differences in approaches and methods, what is common within this field is a view of learning and instruction as social processes situated in social situations and contexts, where participants are engaged in mutual social actions (e.g., Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Kääntä, 2010; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). The development of the social-interactional perspective led to the questioning of the ontological separation between language learning and language use (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). The foundations for this development largely took place at the end of the 1990s, partly because of, and parallel to, the rapid increase in the number of social-interactional studies on L2 learning that applied CA (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hall, 1997; Hall et al., 2011; Kääntä, 2010; Kurhila, 2001; Lilja, 2010; Markee, 1995, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004, and many more). These studies contended that CA's participant-oriented analysis and understanding of social interaction can help better understand how L2 learning in interaction is accomplished. Within this body of research, a small group of studies approached learning as social action that participants actively do in interaction, calling it "doing learning" (Lee, 2010; Melander, 2012;

Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk, Pörn, & Sahlström, 2016b; Sahlström, 2011; Wagner, 2010). Learning, then, is analyzed from an emic participant's perspective through considering the learning object as an emergent, shared pedagogical focus that is locally established, co-constructed, and relevant for the participants doing learning as social action (Lee, 2010).

This body of research considers the epistemics of interaction, knowing, and the dynamic relations between participants' knowledge of oriented-to learning object(s) as vital in the practices used to do learning as social action. Research on epistemics in interaction has advanced rapidly in recent years within the CA research community (e.g., Antaki, 2013; Goodwin, 2013; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Melander, 2012; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011; Tanner, 2014), as well as in the CA field on language learning (e.g., Jakonen, 2014a, 2014b; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Koole, 2010; Käntä, 2014; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Sert, 2013; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). This study is positioned within this field of CA studies and investigates how the incongruent interrogative is part of the practices that participants use to perform L2 learning as social action in peer-to-peer situations. The epistemics framework is used to convey the epistemic complexity and the epistemic sensitiveness of participants' practices from an emic perspective.

1.3 The management of epistemic (in)congruence

In the organization of epistemic relationships, participants express their "epistemic stance," which is, largely, the expressed reflection of the speaker's "epistemic status" regarding the oriented-to epistemic domain and the co-participants (e.g., Heritage, 2012c, 2012d; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Karlsson, 2006; Sahlström, 2011; Stivers et al., 2011). The epistemic stance is managed through the design of turns-at-talk, in which a participant can express a relatively "knowing" or a relatively "unknowing" stance. The epistemic status involves a participant's position—a more knowledgeable (K+) or a less knowledgeable (K-) position—on an epistemic gradient related to

the co-participants and to the relevant epistemic domain (Heritage, 2012a, 2012c). Usually, participants maintain consistency and congruency between their relative knowledge of a domain (epistemic status) and the knowing they express in the unfolding interaction (epistemic stance).

Management of epistemic congruence concerns the participants' management of their epistemic statuses and stances relative to the epistemic domains and the co-participants' statuses and stances. Epistemic congruence is expressed, on the one hand, when a participant's expressed epistemic stance is compatible with his or her epistemic status relative to an epistemic domain and, on the other hand, when said expressed status is congruent with those of the co-participants (Heritage, 2012a, 2012c, 2012d). In other words, epistemic congruence is an intersubjective fact achieved in the unfolding of the social interaction (Heritage, 2013). Congruence and the epistemic status of a participant are central, pragmatic resources when co-participants determine whether an utterance is requesting or asserting information. The linguistic design seems to be trumped by the participants' epistemic statuses and the management of epistemic congruence for determining whether, for example, an interrogative is asserting or requesting information (Heritage, 2012c, 2013). Due to various motives, participants may also express incongruent stances and appear either more or less knowledgeable than they are (e.g., Drew, 2012; Heinemann, Steensig, & Lindström, 2011; Heritage, 2013; Raymond & Heritage, 2006).

Based on this framework, known-answer questions—interrogative questions that ask for information that is primarily within the speaker's epistemic domain—are incongruent. There is an incongruity between the epistemic stance (unknowing) and the epistemic status (K+). The questions are asking for information that the speaker already has, and in that way, they are incongruent. The epistemic incongruence is dependent on whether the speaker (already) has the information that the question is asking for, or not (Heritage, 2013). These so-called incongruent interrogatives are often asked by adults of children, and asked by teachers of students (cf. Antaki,

2013; Drew, 2012; Margutti, 2010; Markee, 2004; Mori, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Tanner, 2014).

Incongruent interrogatives appear to be an important part of the dynamic epistemic relationships

at play in classrooms (e.g., Gardner, 2012; Markee, 2004). For example, Melander (2012)

analyzed a group of Swedish peers involved with doing learning of a foreign language (Japanese)

and how they, without the teacher, organized the learning activity, including a learning trajectory

in-and-through that displayed to each other their epistemic stances and statuses, that is, "what

they know and that they learn" (Melander, 2012, p. 247).

Analyzing incongruent interrogatives with the help of the epistemics framework can

provide the analyst with tools to better understand how repair practices function in instructional

settings (cf. Schegloff et al., 2002). The incongruent interrogatives analyzed in this study do not

appear to address problems of hearing, speaking, or understanding the talk, which would lead to

repair. The epistemics framework may help better differentiate and discover situations and

practices when participants are actively oriented to doing L2 learning. These situations may or

may not involve repair operations. Thus, instead of merely orienting to practices as repair, the

analysis can better discover when and how participants orient to locally relevant practices as L2

learning. The notions of epistemic status and epistemic congruence, as well as the entire

analytical framework of CA on epistemics, provide a more nuanced view and a better

understanding of the subtle intricacy in the use of incongruent interrogatives in the interactional

organization of the L2 classroom.

The aim of this article is to investigate a specific interactional practice (incongruent

interrogatives) and how peers use this practice to perform L2 learning. The analyzed local

contexts are characterized by a participant (oriented-to as K+) asking a co-participant (oriented-to

as K-) an incongruent interrogative regarding an oriented-to learning object related to L2

knowledge.

2. Data and Methodology

The article's data corpus stems from two datasets that were video-recorded during two research projects: Classroom Tandem (2012–2015) and Multilingual Learning and Identity in the Everyday Lives of Finnish Children (2006–2011). These datasets include recordings of several participants, ages 6–17, in- and outside the classroom in bilingual (Finnish-Swedish) educational settings. Such varied and rich data are used for the study to collect multiple instances of similar practices being done by several different participants in several different contexts to better discern possible generic properties of the investigated practice (Sidnell, 2012).

One part of the data consists of video recordings of classroom tandem courses for 16-year-old students in upper secondary school. The recordings were made during the research project Classroom Tandem (Swedish: Klasstandem, 2012–2015). An opportunity to develop and study classroom tandem arose in January 2012 when a Swedish-speaking upper secondary school and a Finnish-speaking upper secondary school moved into the same building creating a Finnish-Swedish bilingual campus. The schools retained their independence as two separate school systems regarding the curriculum and the school language; however, courses in classroom tandem were planned to enable cross-linguistic cooperation. This setting provided the ideal backdrop for developing classroom tandem (Finnish-Swedish) at a bilingual campus in a bilingual area of Finland (Swedish Ostrobothnia).

The tandem courses applied general tandem language learning features: Two individuals with different first languages (L1) form a tandem dyad and learn each other's L1 in-and-through interaction in reciprocal cooperation (e.g., Brammerts, 2003; Karjalainen, 2011; Karjalainen, Pörn, Rusk, & Björkskog, 2013; Löf et al., 2016). The partners in tandem dyads function, in every other lesson, as an L2 learner and as a model and resource in their L1. In classroom

tandem, the teacher supports the students, encouraging them to use their L1-speaking partners as an L2 resource. The interaction in the L2 in classroom tandem is, as in content-based language instruction, an aim and a means for learning.

The classroom tandem data comprise approximately 95 hours of video data from four courses that were recorded in Spring and Fall 2013–2014. Data in Spring 2013, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014 were recorded by one researcher with one video camera. The focus of the recordings was to capture the interaction of one tandem dyad in each course. The recordings also involved the use of an external microphone, which was placed so that good-quality audio of the focal tandem dyad's interaction could be captured. The Fall 2014 data were recorded with two GoPro cameras (small, easy-to-use high-definition [HD] cameras) placed on the table in front of the two tandem dyads throughout the course. The cameras were placed facing the dyads and close enough to get good audio and visual recordings of the tandem dyads' interaction.

The other part of the data consists of week-long video recordings of the everyday interactions of two 7-year-old multilingual children at school: Sara (recorded in 2008) and Simon (recorded in 2006). The recordings were part of the research project Multilingual Learning and Identity in the Everyday Lives of Finnish Children (MULIE, in Swedish FLIS [Flerspråkiga barns lärande och identitet i och utanför skolan], 2006–2011). The research project aimed at understanding learning and identity-construction in the everyday lives of Finnish children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds at school, in the home, and in other everyday situations.

Sara was born in Finland and is of African descent; she attends a Swedish-language preschool in a Finnish-dominated region of Finland. She mainly speaks Swedish when interacting with her parents (who speak Swahili), but they also speak English at home. Simon attends a Swedish-speaking school in which he attends a Content and Language Integrated Learning

(CLIL) class, where the language of instruction is a mix of English and Swedish (Sjöholm &

Björklund, 1999). Most of the children in the class are from Swedish-speaking homes, but some

have L1 linguistic backgrounds that are not Swedish or Finnish. Simon speaks Finnish with his

mother and Swedish with his father. At school, Simon speaks Swedish, Finnish, and English with

his peers. The combined data for Sara and Simon analyzed for the present article totaled

approximately 85 hours of video recordings of both children's everyday lives at preschool and

school. The recordings focused on the children and their interaction partners (peers and teachers)

and attempted to capture the children's everyday interaction at school. Sara and Simon wore

wireless microphones to maximize the possibility of capturing good audio for the analysis.

The study draws on an analysis of two varied datasets to be able to make generalized

conclusions and tease out generic properties of the analyzed practice (e.g., Sidnell, 2012).

Classroom tandem's central function is to provide opportunities for peers to scaffold and support

each other's language learning. Classroom tandem also focuses on task completion. However,

these roles are not present in the same way in the data of the 7-year-old children who do learning

outside the classroom and with their peers. That is why the data corpus was expanded to include

data from various bilingual settings in which peers may perform L2 learning in-and-through the

use of incongruent interrogatives.

CA's analytical evidence is data-internal; that is, the analyst should construct the analysis

based on the empirical findings in the data. That is, the analysis is constructed by adopting a CA

perspective—an emic participant's perspective—and by being open to discovering new

phenomena instead of searching through the data with pre-conceived notions or hypotheses

(Seedhouse, 2004). The phenomena analyzed in this article were, and became, emergent in the

data as a result of repeated "unmotivated looking" (e.g., Schegloff, 1999; Seedhouse, 2004). The

known-answer question appeared to be part of the interactional toolbox that peers use with each

other when they explicitly negotiate and orient to each other's L2 knowledge. Thus, the data selection included multiple similar instances of said phenomenon, situations characterized by a participant who was oriented-to as K+ (in relation to the co-participant and the oriented-to L2 knowledge) asking an incongruent interrogative regarding L2 knowledge. These instances, 31 in all, were transcribed and analyzed with a focus on the management of epistemic congruence and doing L2 learning. The findings are based on the larger body of analyzed material but are exemplified through six excerpts in which a more knowledgeable participant asks an incongruent interrogative regarding an oriented-to learning object in the L2. The analytical focus is the local context, the oriented-to content, and the actions that the participants recognize the incongruent interrogative practices to accomplish in situations when the participants explicitly orient to L2 learning objects. The purpose is to demonstrate how L2 learning can be understood as social action that the participants do and relate to in interaction. The focus is on learning in a specific practice being done and content being talked into being in interaction. That is, the point of departure for the study is the practices used to do learning on the specific content of the L2. Consequently, bilingual educational settings in which formal and informal L2 learning was possible were chosen as the settings for the study. The interaction was transcribed using CA conventions (Hepburn & Bolden, 2012; Jefferson, 2004).[2]

3. Interactional practices around incongruent interrogatives in peer interaction

Of the 31 situations, we present six in which a K+ participant asks an incongruent interrogative regarding an oriented-to learning object in L2. The focus is the interactional practices carried out around the incongruent interrogative and the work the incongruent interrogative does in L2 learning situations. The excerpts are divided into three groups based on the recipient's response and understanding of the speaker's conduct—the uptake.

The first group includes situations in which a K+ participant asks an incongruent interrogative in the next turn after the K- participant expresses an unknowing stance regarding the oriented-to content. The second group includes situations in which the K+ participant initiates a sequence by asking an incongruent interrogative in the first turn of the sequence and with the questions initiates an instructional sequence. In both groups, the K- participants (the recipients) respond by aligning with the invitations to do L2 learning that the incongruent interrogatives initiate. The K- participants show an orientation toward the help that the K+ participant provides, and they seem to actively try to find out the answer by producing possible answers or expressing weak unknowing stances. The third group presents deviant cases in the data collection. They are examples of a response by the recipient that had not been predicted by the speaker (Sidnell, 2012). In these situations, the K- participant resists engaging in the instructional sequence that the incongruent interrogative initiates by changing the projected trajectory of the sequence, and the K+ participant subsequently orients to this contingency.

3.1 Incongruent interrogative after expressed unknowing

The following two situations are examples of how K+ participants orient to the unfolding and previously expressed epistemic asymmetries by asking an incongruent interrogative regarding the K- participants' expressed unknowing stance. The excerpts also illustrate how K- participants align with the sequence trajectory that the incongruent interrogative appears to propose. Excerpt 1 is an example from a classroom tandem lesson in Finnish. In the excerpt, the L2 speaker, Henni (Swedish as L1), translates sentences that are written on a sheet of paper from Swedish to Finnish. Her tandem partner, Kati (Finnish as L1), is supposed to support Henni as she performs the task.[3]

Excerpt 1. Coffee and a roll.

```
(1) kahvi_ja_pulla_fi_KH060514_33.33-33.50

   01 H: pal:jonko. (0.8) on. (0.7) kahvia, (0.5) pull:::- pullossa.
         ho:w much.       is.      coffee,       bott:::-  in the bottle.
   02    (.)  a(h)e(h)e(h)e
   03 K:       (sä voit)
               (you can)
-> 04 K: mikä  (.) mikä toi  on niinku. (0.6) >mitä se   on suomeks<
         what      what that is like.         >what  that is in Finnish<
   05          ((points on paper))
   06    (0.8)
   07 H: m(h)m (0.7) pulla.
                     roll.
   08 K: >joo-o.< (.) hy vä.
         >ye:s.<       go od.
   09 H:              a(h)e(h) ok(h)ej
                              ok(h)ay
   10 K: ja, (.) sitte, (0.4) niinku- (.) mitä maksaa,
         and,    then,        like-       what cost,
         (1.3)
   11 K: niinku,=
         like,=
   12 H: =kahvi=ja:,
         =coffee=and:,
   13 K: kahvi, (.) ja,
         coffee, (.) and,
   14    (1.1)
   15 H: pullo?
         bottle?
   16 K: pulla.
         roll.
   17 H: pulla.
         roll.
   18 K: joo.
         yes.
   19 H: ((starts writing answer on paper))
```

The learning object that the participants orient to is the sentence "*Vad kostar en kaffe med bulle?*" ("How much is a coffee with a roll?"), and more precisely, the Finnish translation of the Swedish word *bulle* (roll). Henni invites Kati to help her as Henni clearly indicates that she has problems translating the sentence (line 1) as she turns to Kati and giggles nervously (line 2). When Henni asks for help, she expresses a weak unknowing stance and orients to her K- status and Kati's K+ status (lines 1–2). Kati responds by asking an incongruent interrogative (line 4).

She uses hesitation markers and a restart of the turn in line 4, thus projecting that the question is dispreferred. Kati's unknowing stance is incongruent because her status regarding knowledge of Finnish is oriented to as K+, and asking for something that one knows (or should know) may be considered dispreferred in peer interaction (Goffman, 1971; Heritage, 2012a). The turn is grammatically formed as an interrogative, including the first part, "What is that?," which is redesigned as "What is that in Finnish?" She points simultaneously to a word (*bulle*/roll, line 5) on the paper and keeps her finger there throughout the sequence to clearly display the learning object. Henni provides the correct answer (line 7), which Kati confirms and comments on (line 8), thus reaffirming her status as K+ (Drew, 1981; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Henni giggles and acknowledges that she knew the correct answer (line 9). In the following turn, Kati repeats the first part of the sentence and indicates that Henni is supposed to complete it with the translation that they recently confirmed as correct (lines 10–11). Henni latches on to Kati's previous turn and, hesitantly, begins to answer (line 12). Kati repeats the word *kahvi* (coffee) as a way to ask for the last word. Henni says *pullo* (bottle) with a try-marked intonation, and this time, Kati repairs the word directly (lines 15–16). Henni then repeats the correct answer, and Kati confirms it before Henni starts writing the correct answer on the paper.

In Excerpt 1, the epistemic asymmetry between the participants in the epistemic domain of L2 knowledge is interactionally expressed in Henni's hesitant and incorrect attempt to answer the question. In-and-through that expressed unknowing stance, regarding the sentence and the word *bulle* (roll), she asks Kati for help (lines 1–2). In other words, Henni (K-) expresses in the talk-in-interaction a less knowledgeable epistemic status concerning L2 knowledge in relation to Kati (K+). Kati orients to this expressed unknowing, and bid for help, by asking an incongruent interrogative regarding a specific lexical item that was incorrect in Henni's initial attempt at translating the sentence. The incongruent interrogative is designed so that a claim of knowledge

would not be an adequate response; the design of the question requires a demonstration of

knowledge, which Henni provides and Kati confirms (lines 7–8). Then the situation continues as

an instructional sequence in which Kati scaffolds Henni toward the correct answer, which Henni

writes down on the paper.

In Excerpt 2, the tandem dyad Aron and Minna are working together at a computer on a

Swedish language lesson. Minna (Finnish as L1) is the L2 speaker, and Aron (Swedish as L1) is

the L1 speaker. Minna's assignment is to write a letter in Swedish to a friend, telling him or her

what they will do when the friend visits Minna in the summer.

Excerpt 2. Ride.

```
(2) åkattraktion_AM070313-1_46.10-46.42

   01 M: ((writes 'Jag tycker att den bästa åkattraktion är vikingaskeppet'))
   02 A: öm:: (0.5) nu (0.3) >tänkt ja fråga dig att lite     att< (.)
         um::        now       >thought I  ask     you that a little that
   03    ⌈åkattraktion.           ⌉så e (.) en å(t)rattraktio:n
         ⎢ride.                   ⎢so is      a  ri:de
   04    ⌊((points at word on screen))⌋
-> 05    va   tror du  de blir    om de-e (0.6) just preci:s. (0.4) den:,
         what think you it becomes if it=is       exa:ctly            that:,
   06    (2.4)
-> 07 A: hu  tror du-du-  b:öjer å:traktra- <åkattraktion>
         how think you-you inflect ri:de-     <ride>
   08    (1.3)
   09 A: fö(r)    de-e just    den,
         (be)cause it=is exactly that,
   10    (1.3)
   11 M: den, (0.7) å(t/k)attraktionen
         that,       ride(+suffix -en)
   12 A: (bra)=perfekt
         (good)=perfect
   13 M: ((adds E & N to the base -> 'åkattraktionen'))
```

Minna has written the word *åkattraktion* (similar to *ride* at a theme park) in a sentence

(line 1) where it would be grammatically correct to use the definite inflection of the word, which

includes the suffix *-en* (*åkattraktionen* [the ride]). This grammatical error appears to act as a

practice that expresses the epistemic asymmetry between the participants, and to which Aron orients when he asks an incongruent interrogative. Aron has received instructions from the teacher that he is supposed to correct Minna's text so that it corresponds with "good Swedish." He does interactive work in a pre-sequence (lines 2–4) and projects his next action as dispreferred. He appears to orient to the incongruent interrogative as problematic and potentially face-threatening to Minna (Goffman, 1971; Heritage, 2012a).

Aron points out the problem word *åkattraktion* (ride, line 3), and he also explicitly utters it (line 3), that is, the learning object. In line 5, he asks a question regarding the inflection of a Swedish word, which is knowledge that is primarily within his epistemic domain; that is, an incongruent interrogative. In the same turn he also gives Minna clues (e.g., Carroll, 2004; Hellermann, 2005; Lerner, 1995) to what the problem is and asks her what she thinks the correct answer is. Aron gives Minna time to think for more than two seconds (line 6) before he asks another incongruent interrogative and mitigates the possibly face-threatening aspects by using the preface "what do you think" (e.g., Aijmer, 1997; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Turnbull & Saxton, 1997). This time, he points out that the inflection is incorrect (line 6). There is another relatively long pause before Aron once more points out that the word's inflection must be definite (line 9, similar to line 5) by again emphasizing the article *den* (the), which, in this case, requires a definite inflection of *åkattraktion* with the suffix *-en*. Minna repeats the word *den* (the) as she provides the correct answer and emphasizes the previously missing definite suffix *-en* (line 11). Aron confirms and evaluates her answer in the third turn (line 12), thus reaffirming his K+ status. Minna types on the computer and adds the suffix *-en* to the word *åkattraktion* (ride), and then they continue working on the text.

In Excerpt 2, the epistemic asymmetry between the participants is expressed by Minna writing a grammatical error that Aron notices and makes explicit through an incongruent

interrogative. It is followed up by Aron providing knowledge to support Minna in finding the answer. Aron orients to Minna's silence as an indicator of her thinking and trying to find the answer; she is aligning with doing L2 learning with Aron's help. Excerpt 2 is an example of peer instruction in which Aron orients to Minna's incorrect spelling as he points to the screen and utters the word that must be corrected. He supports her by giving her help regarding what must be corrected in the word. Minna orients to Aron's incongruent interrogative as a K+ participant who is giving her clues to how to correct the mistake. Both participants orient to the situation as one in which the K+ participant supports the K- participant in changing his or her knowledge of a specific L2 learning object from unknowing to knowing, albeit without providing the answer directly.

Excerpts 1 and 2 mainly illustrate three aspects that appear to play into the contingency of whether an incongruent interrogative is used—and oriented to—as a practice that is part of doing L2 learning. The first aspect is that the participants' reciprocal epistemic statuses regarding knowledge of the oriented-to learning objects appear to be an expressed and settled matter. The incongruent interrogatives in excerpts 1 and 2 are asked in the next turn after an unknowing stance regarding the locally emergent and oriented-to learning object. Therefore, the incongruent interrogatives are oriented-to as questions regarding knowledge that primarily falls within the speaker's epistemic domain. The recipients (K- participants) are supposed to answer the questions with the help of the K+ participants. In-and-through the use of incongruent interrogatives, the participants move from orienting to each other as peers (with different statuses in L2 knowledge) to co-constructing the roles of L2 teacher and L2 learner; an instructional sequence emerges.

The second aspect is the design of the incongruent interrogatives. The use of a known-answer question may be oriented-to as teasing (Evaldsson & Sahlström, 2014); therefore, the use

of an incongruent interrogative may be a delicate matter. For example, an incongruent interrogative may be oriented-to as projecting the recipient as knowing, which is an invasion by the speaker of the recipient's territory of knowledge (e.g., Goffman, 1971; Heritage, 2012a). In other words, the speaker claims knowledge of what the recipient knows. This may be why the K+ participants design the turns to mitigate the dispreference of asking something that they themselves know the answer to; the K- participants do not appear to consider the incongruent interrogatives problematic, as the projected sequence trajectory is that of an instructional sequence. It appears that both participants recognize the incongruent interrogative as a practice in relation to scaffolding and support (e.g., Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lerner, 1995; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), as well as an invitation to do L2 learning.

The third aspect is that the K+ participants appear to lay the interactional ground for the K- participants to succeed in knowing the oriented-to learning object. The K+ participants do not use the incongruent interrogatives to substantiate the epistemic asymmetries or to ask rhetorical or pre-informing questions (cf. Heritage, 2013). This is partly indicated by the fact that the K+ participants give "clues" and "background information" to pave the way for the K- participants to successfully arrive at the answers themselves. The K+ participants use the incongruent interrogative to reaffirm their K+ status but also to give the K- participants a chance to "self-repair" (e.g., Schegloff, 2007). These aspects appear to explain how, and why, the participants understand incongruent interrogatives as part of the social practices of doing L2 learning.

3.2 Incongruent interrogative in the first turn as an invitation to an instructional sequence

In the situations in excerpts 1 and 2, the incongruent interrogatives are uttered after trouble appears during the K- speaker's turn. Excerpts 3 and 4 show how an incongruent interrogative can be used in the first turn as an invitation to an instructional sequence regarding a locally emergent learning object. In Excerpt 3, Simon and Tomás are walking with the rest of their class

to lunch. Two hours before, the students had had physical education class, during which they sang a children's song in Swedish about the different parts of the body: "Head, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes." When Simon washes his hands before going to lunch, he starts to sing the song, and before the students enter the lunchroom, Simon runs up to Tomás and asks an incongruent interrogative. The knowledge that the question concerns (the pronunciation of a Swedish word) is primarily in Simon's epistemic domain in relation to Tomás. Tomás has Spanish as his L1, and the other children in the class speak in English with him.

Excerpt 3. Can you say huvud?

```
(3) cand you say huvud

-> 01 S: ⎡cand you say huvud?⎤
         ⎢             head?  ⎥
   02    ⎣((looks at Tomás))  ⎦
   03 T: huvud?
         head?
   04    (1.3)
   05 T: I ⎡can say    ⎤
-> 06 S:   ⎢axlar?     ⎥
          ⎣shoulders? ⎦
   07 T: axlard?   >I can say everything you ⎡say in Swedish< ⎤
         shoulderds?
   08 S:                                     ⎢ax:       ⎢lar  ⎥
                                             ⎣shoul:    ⎣ders ⎦
   09 E: ⎡((turns towards the boys))⎤
   10 T: ⎢ax- axlard?               ⎥
         ⎣sh-  shoulderds?          ⎦
   11 S: axlar
         shoulders
   12 T: a-axlard
         s-shoulderds
   13    ⎡(1.5)
   14 S: ⎣((turns towards the camera, smiles))
   15 T: if you say something to me I can always say what you say
   16 S: no you can't say <axlar>
                          <shoulders>
   17 T: <axla:r(d)>
         <shoulde:r(d)s>
   18       (1.0)
   19 S: no dat ⎡de:
   20 L:        ⎢ Tomás
   21           ⎣((touches Tomás' back)) ⎡((points to his own shoulders))
   22 L:                                 ⎢Tomás ((touches Tomás' back))
   23 S:                                 ⎣axlar
   24 T: ⎡axlar    ⎤
         ⎢shoulders⎥
   25 L: ⎣Tomás    ⎦⎡Tomás look
   26                ⎣((touches Tomás' back, points to his own shoulders))
   27 S: Tomás kan säg axlar ((turns towards some of his peers sitting around a table))
         Tomás  can say  shoulders
```

Lines 1–4 concern the pronunciation of the Swedish word *huvud* (head), and lines 5–27 concern

the pronunciation of the Swedish word *axlar* (shoulders). The situation may be understood as

Simon using an incongruent interrogative to tease or to doing-being playful (e.g., Evaldsson &

Sahlström, 2014). However, the uptake by Tomás does not indicate this, and Simon does not

appear to design his turns with smile voices, for example. The situation is initiated by Simon

(K+) who asks an incongruent interrogative regarding the pronunciation of the Swedish word

huvud (head), asking if Tomás (K-) can "say" it (lines 1–2). Tomás provides an answer and

displays no problem pronouncing the word (line 3). However, Tomás gets no response from

Simon; instead, there is a long silence (line 4). Tomás launches a turn in line 5 but is interrupted

by Simon who asks another incongruent interrogative (line 6) that is connected to the song he

was singing. Tomás, who Simon is orienting to as K- regarding the learning object and L2

(Swedish) knowledge, answers in the next turn and adds that he can say anything that Simon says

in Swedish (line 7). Tomás orients to Simon's incongruent interrogatives as "easy," sought-for

knowledge and to himself as knowing regarding the pronunciation of the words. However,

Tomás's pronunciation is incorrect, as noted by Simon when he overlaps and repeats the word

using correct pronunciation (line 8). In line 10, Tomás tries to pronounce the word again; this

time, he restarts the turn, which indicates a weaker knowing stance regarding pronunciation

compared to line 7. He still, incorrectly, pronounces a "d" sound at the end of the word. He also

designs the turn as try-marked for Simon to confirm or reject. In lines 13–14, there is a silence,

during which Simon turns to the camera and smiles. Tomás orients to the silence as confirmation

that he pronounced the word correctly (similar to lines 4–5), which is indicated by him repeating

that he can say anything that Simon asks him to say (line 15). Simon orients to his K+ status

when he explicitly disagrees and says that Tomás cannot pronounce *axlar* (shoulders) correctly

(line 16). Tomás tries to pronounce the word again, but Simon seems to still hear a "d" in the end

of the word (lines 17–18). Another Swedish-speaking boy, Lukas, has overheard the conversation and joins in by tapping on Tomás's back and pointing to his own shoulders (lines 20–22). Simon repeats the word (line 23), and in line 24, Tomás appears to pronounce the word correctly, which is indicated by Simon confirming to the other children at lunch that Tomás can now say *axlar* (shoulders, line 27).

Simon asks the incongruent interrogatives (lines 1 and 6) of Tomás who answers them in a way that appears to evoke the situated identities of L2 teacher and L2 learner (cf. Lilja, 2014). Both boys orient to the reciprocal roles in-and-through an orientation to epistemically asymmetric K+ and K- statuses. The interactional practices are very similar to teacher–student interaction. The K+ participant has the right to ask "non-communicative" questions (regarding information that is primarily in his or her epistemic domain), and the K- participant stands in a position to answer and to be evaluated by the former who decides whether the latter's pronunciation in Swedish is correct or not. The K+ participant uses the incongruent interrogative to initiate the social practice of doing L2 learning, and the K- participant aligns with the invitation to do L2 learning. This understanding of the situation is supported by how a third party, Lukas, interprets the situation as Simon and Tomás doing learning when Lukas tries to help Tomás understand. Another form of evidence for understanding that Simon and Tomás are doing learning is that the sequence is closed as Tomás pronounces the word correctly, and in the lunchroom, Simon tells their peers about the successful pronunciation.

Excerpt 4 is from a Finnish lesson in a classroom tandem course and involves the tandem dyad Petteri (Finnish as L1) and Janne (Swedish as L1). Janne has trouble translating the Swedish sentence "*ge upplevelsepresenter istället för vanliga paket*" (give experience gifts instead of ordinary presents) into Finnish, and Petteri helps with the word *upplevelsepresenter* (experience gifts) by providing the correct answer when Janne has trouble knowing (lines 1–8). However,

before Janne moves on to the next word, Petteri asks a question regarding what the word (*istället*) means and how to translate it. In other words, the question is an incongruent interrogative (line 9), since this knowledge is primarily in Petteri's epistemic domain. The question also changes the trajectory of the sequence and transforms it into another form of instructional sequence in which the incongruent interrogative is the initiating turn.

Excerpt 4. Instead.

```
(4) fi_sijaan_PJ260814-3

    01 J: upplevels- (1.8) mä v- se on niinkun (.) kotitekoi- (2.1) kotitekoista.
          experienc-        I  c- it is like         homema-        homemade.
    02 P: tai-
          or-
    03 J: no, (.) niin, (.) jotain  joka (.) sä  oot tehny(t) ite
          yea,     well,    something that     you have done    yourself
    04 P: niin, (0.5) niin, (0.8) tai, (.) eiks upplevelse no   eikse oo niinku el-
          yea,        yea,         or,    isn't experience well isn't it like   ex-
    05    elämys
          experience
    06    (1.2)
    06 J: nojoo,  (.) joo=nojoo.
          well yea,   yea=well yea.
    07 P: sillei niinku et  jo- (0.7) jotenki erikoinen
          kinda  like    that so-      somehow special
    08 J: joo
->  09 P: sit siin o(n) se  is:tället (.) kuinka sä  sano(i)t se(n).
          then there is    that instead      how do  you sa(y/id)  it
    10    (0.7)
    11 J: a(h)e(h)e:(h) .hh
    12   ⌈(3.8)              ⌉
    13 J: ⌊((looks at paper))⌋
    14 J: °°istället°°
          °°instead°°
    15   ⌈(5.4)              ⌉
    16 J: ⌊((looks at paper))⌋
    17   ⌈(2.0)                            ⌉
    18 J: ⌊((looks up and glances at P))   ⌋
    19 J: >sä  o(n/t) sanonut sen< (0.4) pari     kerra:. jo     (.) hh
          ou have      said    it<        a couple of ti:me.  already
    20 P: jos sul on  tommone istället, (0.4) ⌈la ⌉use  nii sä  voit sanoo sillee täs on
          if  you have that    instead,        ⌊sen⌋tence then you can   say    like   this is
    21                                          ((p o i n t s   o n   p a p e r))
    22 J:                                         ⌈ja,⌉
                                                  ⌊yes,⌋
    23 P: ⌈tää.=tämä (1.1) sijaan tämä=ni sä voit sanoo sillee tämä (0.4) tämän sijaan.
          ⌊this.=this      instead this=so you can  say   like   this       this  instead.
    24   ⌊((p o i n t s   o n   p a p e r))
    25   ⌈sillee, (1.3) elämyslahjoja, (.) >tavallisten pakettien< sijaan. etse tulee⌉
          ⌊like,         experience gift    >ordinary    presents<  instead. so it comes⌋
    26   ⌊((p o i n t s   o n   p a p e r))
    27    sinne ⌈(0.4)⌉loppuun  tavallaan
          there  ⌊     ⌋in the end kind of
    28 J:        ⌊jahaa.⌋
                  ahaa.
    29 J: o.kej,
          o.kay,
```

The turn in line 9 initiates another form of instructional sequence regarding the next learning object that they orient to, since the previous—regarding *upplevelsepresenter* (experience gifts)—was closed. Petteri utters the next learning object (*istället*, which means *instead*) and asks

an incongruent interrogative (line 9). Janne laughs, looks at the sentence on the paper for a long time, and utters the trouble word softly to himself (lines 11–14). In line 15, there is an exceptionally long pause when Janne looks at the paper. He then orients to the fact that they have done learning on the word before (line 19). Petteri's use of past tense in line 9 (*sanoit*, said) also indicates that they have done some learning on this before (e.g., Sahlström, 2011). Janne is given interactional space (lines 11–18), and Petteri orients to this when he launches a sequence in which he uses the sentence written on the paper to explain how Janne can translate Swedish sentences that include the word *istället* (*instead*) into Finnish (lines 20–27). Janne acknowledges that Petteri has launched an instructional sequence (line 22) and aligns to it by uttering change-of-state tokens in lines 28 and 29 (Heritage, 1984; Lindström, 2008). In line 28, Janne orients to Petteri's projection of a turn completion, and in line 29, Janne confirms that the instructional sequence was completed and that he has heard the instructions.

In Excerpt 4, the participants talk their reciprocal epistemic statuses into being in-and-through expressing that the oriented-to learning object has to do with knowledge that they have done learning on before. Petteri orients to this longitudinality of doing L2 learning in line 1 when he expresses, using an incongruent interrogative, that it is knowledge that Janne should have when he uses the past tense: *sanoit* (said). In-and-through this turn, Petteri occupies a K+ position on the epistemic gradient in relation to Janne and the oriented-to learning object. Janne is asked what *istället* (instead) could be in Finnish, as well as what it means, and he aligns with the question's projection as he attempts to find out what the answer could be (lines 3–11). Aspects that indicate his alignment with finding out the answer include repeating the word softly to himself and looking at the paper for a long time until he acknowledges that they have done learning on the oriented-to learning object before. Both participants express and orient to each other's roles as the L2 teacher (asking incongruent interrogative, initiating instructing, and doing

L2 learning) and the L2 learner (aligning by attempting to produce an answer and engaging in doing instruction and L2 learning). The sequence is closed with Janne uttering change-of-state tokens (Heritage, 1984; Lindström, 2008).

Excerpts 3 and 4 exemplify how the participants talk into being and orient to each other's reciprocal roles as the L2 teacher and the L2 learner, as in excerpts 1 and 2. However, excerpts 3 and 4 illustrate how participants can orient to these roles without a participant having to express an unknowing epistemic stance regarding the locally oriented-to learning object in the precedent turn of the incongruent interrogative. The participants appear to treat the matter of their relative epistemic statuses vis-à-vis each other and the oriented-to learning object as a relatively settled matter (cf. Heritage, 2012d). The K- participant orients to and aligns with the invitation to do L2 learning that the K+ participant's incongruent interrogative appears to initiate. The K- participant, in both situations, attempts to find out the answer. In Excerpt 3, Tomás tries to pronounce it and changes his pronunciation in accordance with Simon's support, and in Excerpt 4, Janne looks at the sentence on the paper for a long time (line 4), appears to try to find out the answer, and says that they have previously done learning on it (line 7). The K+ participants support, help, and instruct the K- participants to provide enough background knowledge for the K- participants to produce an answer (Excerpt 3) or to confirm and acknowledge a change from unknowing to knowing (Excerpt 4). The participants orient to the incongruent interrogatives as invitations to do L2 learning in cooperation with each other. The interactional role of each participant's epistemic status appears to be crucial when producing and recognizing the incongruent interrogatives as invitations to do L2 learning and not as rhetorical questions or teasing (Evaldsson & Sahlström, 2014).

3.3 Disalignment with the incongruent interrogative's projected sequence trajectory

The final two situations analyzed in this article illustrate how K- participants also can disalign with engaging in doing L2 learning that an incongruent interrogative by a K+ participant appears to initiate. The following excerpts also exemplify the epistemic sensitivity that the K+ participants express regarding when and how the K- participant aligns with or disaligns with doing L2 learning.

In Excerpt 5, Sara and her friend, Hanna, are on their way outside to recess. The girls have a piece of paper with various English words. The paper has previously been used on several occasions during the recorded week that they orient toward doing L2 learning (cf. Sahlström, 2011). In the excerpt, Sara initiates a sequence in which she wants Hanna to use English at home with her parents or with her brother.

Excerpt 5. Say hi to your brother.

```
(5) as220408-8_sag hi ti din bror

   01 S: hej säg ti han- hej säg ti ha- (.) hej du  kan v- du  kan
         hey say to han- hey say to ha-     hey you can w- you can
   02    (0.5)
   03 S: du  kan fråga? ti din, (0.3) storebror att  att  öhm
         you can ask    to your,       big brother that that uhm
   04    (1.6)
-> 05 S: att (h)wha are you doing big brother. (.) vet du     de,
         that                                       do you know it,
   06 H: jå: (.) va   e de (på)?
         yea (.) what is it (in)?
   07 S: de-e va   gör du      lill:e-  storebror? (.) hej, (.) va?
         it's what are you doing littl:e- big brother? (.) hey, (.) wha?
   08 H: (nä)
         (no)
   09 S: vaffö vÅgar? du int å  säga nånting på engelska
         why   dAre?  you not to say   anything in english
   10 H: ja- ja glÖmmer de (tidigt) ja lo⌈var.
         I-  I  forgEt   it (early)  I  pro│mise.
   11 S:                                    │men du  kan säga hi
                                            │but you can say
-> 12    eller nånting (.) du  kommer ihåg hi eller va?
         or        something   you remember      don't you?
   13 H: jå va   betydde de?
         yea what did it mean?
   14 S: hej (0.8) måst- gö ja brukar ja kan säga
         hey (0.8) you must- do I  use to  I  can say
   15    >hej hej hej hej hej. hej hej-<
         >hey hey hey hey hey. hey hey-<
   16    hi hi hi hi hi hi, (.) hi hi hi, >du  måst säga på
                                          >you must  say  it
   17    riktigt< hi hi hi hi hi hi hi hi hi hi,
         for real<
   18    hi hi hi hi, nu går du ((Hanna leaves)) (.) hi hi hi hi hi,
                      now you go
```

Sara initiates the sequence by telling Hanna that she should say something in English to

her brother (lines 1–3). In line 5, Sara utters the English phrase that Hanna could say to her

brother, and Sara ends the turn with a question regarding knowledge that is primarily within her

epistemic domain; that is, an incongruent interrogative. Hanna claims that she knows what it is,

although she still asks for a confirmation of what the phrase is (line 6). Sara provides the answer

in the next turn, and Hanna, after having been given the answer to what the English phrase means, says *nä* (no, line 8). In other words, she is responding to Sara's suggestion that Hanna will not ask her big brother the question in English. Sara orients toward the longitudinal aspect of Sara having previously asked Hanna to say something in English (line 9). Sara holds Hanna accountable for not aligning with the sequence trajectory, that is, not doing learning and not saying something in English. Hanna provides a reason by saying that she forgets the phrases so quickly (line 10). Hanna is about to continue the turn when Sara interrupts, and overlaps, as she says that Hanna can just say something that is easier (lines 11–12). In line 12, Sara asks another incongruent interrogative. She orients to them having previously done learning on the word *hi*, and that perhaps Hanna remembers what the word means. Hanna claims that she remembers *hi* but continues the turn by asking what it means (line 13). Sara provides the answer in the next turn and continues by showing Hanna how she can learn to remember the word: by repeating it to herself (lines 14–18). Hanna leaves in another (physical) direction when they get outside, and the sequence is closed (line 18).

In the previous excerpts (1–4), the K- participants aligned with the incongruent interrogative's projected action of doing L2 learning and attempting to find out the answer in concert with the K+ participant. Thus, creating a form of interactional "space for learning" (Walsh, 2011) involving an "emphasis is on promoting interactions which are both appropriate to a particular micro-context and to specific pedagogic goals" (Walsh, 2012, p. 6). Excerpt 5 illustrates how a K- participant can express a strong unknowing stance by explicitly asking for the meaning of the oriented-to learning objects in the L2. The K+ participant orients to these stances as the K- participant disaligning with the projected sequence trajectory, that is, to do L2 learning with the support of the K+ participant. Therefore, the K+ participant does not launch an instructional sequence (cf. Markee, 1995, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). Instead, he or she provides the

answer. Sara's incongruent interrogatives are formed as questions that can be answered by claiming knowledge and not with an obligation to demonstrate said knowledge (as in Excerpt 3). However, the participants still orient to the situations similarly as if the questions had asked for more than just a claim of knowledge. The participants appear to orient to the situations as invitations to do learning together. Hanna responds to the incongruent interrogatives by claiming that she knows (line 6) or remembers (line 13) the oriented-to learning objects, but instead of demonstrating L2 (English) knowledge, she asks what the words in the L2 mean in her L1 (Swedish). These second parts of Hanna's turns indicate that she orients to the questions as asking for more than just a claim of knowledge.

Excerpt 6 is a situation from a Swedish classroom tandem lesson in which the tandem dyad Alexandra (L1 speaker, Swedish as L1) and Lumia (L2 speaker, Finnish as L1) are translating Finnish sentences into Swedish. Lumia is supposed to do the translating, and Alexandra's role is to support and help. Before Excerpt 6 begins, Alexandra has read the sentences, and Lumia has translated them.

Excerpt 6. I don't know.

```
(6) sv_LA010914-1(13.46)_jag vet int

   01 A: pari vuotta sitte(n).
         some years   ago.
   02    (3.1)
-> 03 A: pari, (0.7) va   e  de på svenska?
         some,          what is it in  swedish?
   04 L: m: ja vet int=
         m:  I  know not=
   05 A: =nå:gra,
         =so:me,
   06    (0.8)
   07 L: några år    (.) se:dan.
         some   years      ago.
   08 A: ja?
         yes
   09 L: ja(hh)
         ye(hh)s
   10    ((writes answer on paper))
```

In line 1, Alexandra reads the following phrase out loud: "*pari vuotta sitten*" (some years ago). Both have a piece of paper with the sentences in front of them. In line 2, there is a long pause, which indicates that Lumia is having trouble translating the phrase, thus expressing an unknowing stance. Alexandra acknowledges Lumia's problems and orients to her status as K+ when she asks Alexandra what the first word in the sentence is in Swedish (line 3), thus asking an incongruent interrogative–a question regarding knowledge that is primarily within her epistemic domain. incongruent interrogative. Lumia responds by expressing a stronger unknowing stance (line 4) as she explicitly says that she does not know. In the next turn, Alexandra latches on to Lumia's previous turn and provides a partial answer (line 5), after which Lumia translates the phrase into Swedish (line 7), and Alexandra confirms the translation (line 8). In line 9, Lumia acknowledges the confirmation and writes the answer on the paper.

Excerpt 6 exemplifies how the K+ participant orients to the K- participant's different unknowing stances depending on where the participants are positioned on the epistemic gradient

(cf. Heritage, 2012c). The expressed unknowing stance in line 2 (a delayed response) is weaker than the strong statement of not knowing in line 4. The K+ participants, in the data analyzed for the study, do not challenge (cf. ask incongruent interrogatives) the K- participants' outright statements of not knowing or explicit questions regarding L2 knowledge (cf. Markee, 1995, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). The K+ participants seem to orient to the statements as indications of disalignment with the projected sequence trajectory, and the K- participant instead asks for the K+ participant to provide the answer. The instructional sequence is not expanded on. Instead, the sequence moves toward a closing in-and-through the K+ participant providing the correct answer. The participants orient toward closing the sequence and moving on.

In the data analyzed for this article, the K+ participants seem to be attentive to when the L2 speaker is able to find out or know the answer to a problem he or she raised and/or is pointed out by the K+ participant. The epistemic sensitivity of the K+ participants is indicated by the fact that the K+ participants do not use incongruent interrogatives when the K- participants upgrades the unknowing stance and/or explicitly take a strong unknowing stance (see Excerpt 6 below). This action is in contrast to how teachers may push students and repeat the question (Markee 1995, 2004; Rusk et al., 2016a, 2016b; Seedhouse, 2004). The students in the excerpts also seem to pinpoint the use of the incongruent interrogatives to easily accessible, contextual, and lexical learning objects (e.g., single words, not abstract concepts). When the K- participants express strong unknowing stances, for example, by explicitly asking what the answer to the incongruent interrogative is, they do not provide any information regarding their knowledge of the oriented-to learning object that could help the participants in engaging in instructional sequences and do L2 learning. Thus, the K+ participants have trouble knowing where to begin and which aspects of the learning object are unknown or known to the K- participants.

4. Discussion

The incongruent interrogatives analyzed in this article share similar features with other classroom talk, specifically with teacher display questions as, for example, initiations in IRE sequences (e.g., Mehan, 1979; Tanner 2014) and teachers' known-answer questions (Mori, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). In L2 classrooms, the teacher asks incongruent interrogatives to scaffold and support students' learning (e.g., Drew, 2012; Margutti, 2010; Markee, 2004). In the data analyzed for this article, the incongruent interrogative appears to be a way for peers to initiate doing L2 learning and talk the roles of L2 learner and L2 teacher into being in-and-through the contingency of the social interaction.

4.1 Summary

The participants use incongruent interrogatives to initiate L2 learning sequences and peer instructional sequences. The incongruent interrogative appears to do two main actions: (1) initiate an instructional sequence and (2) in-and-through that action, propose reciprocal epistemically asymmetric statuses of K+ and K-, through which the participants co-construct their situated roles as the L2 teacher and the L2 learner. The recipient of an incongruent interrogative is in a position to either align with the projected sequence trajectory by providing possible answers or expressing weak unknowing stances or to disalign with the projected trajectory and not engage actively in the proposed instructional sequence by expressing a strong unknowing stance. In other words, whether participants do—or do not do—learning (as social action) is dependent on a negotiation. If a participant disaligns with the trajectory proposed by the known-answer-question, then the participants are not able to actively cooperate in-and-through the proposed instructional sequence.

Managing epistemics in social interaction also involves face-saving activities or teasing in-and-through claims of knowledge. Incongruent interrogatives involve assumed knowledge of

what the recipient knows or does not know, and the incongruent interrogative seems to partly project the recipient as assumed to be knowing. For example, in ordinary conversation outside classrooms, participants commonly avoid claiming K+ status for an epistemic domain that they do not have epistemic access to (Goffman, 1971; Heritage, 2012a), or they may use this dispreferred action as a way to tease (Evaldsson & Sahlström, 2014). This means that the K+ participant (the speaker) in the situations analyzed for this study runs the risk of invading the recipient's epistemic territory when the K+ participant utters the incongruent interrogative in a sequential place that makes it, in a sense, reject the K- participant's expressed unknowing stance. In most of the cases analyzed for this article, the K- participant produces an answer that is oriented-to as correct by both participants without much help from the K+ participant. However, in some cases the K- participant is unknowing regarding the requested knowledge (e.g., Rusk & Pörn, 2013; Rusk et al., 2016b). The participants in the data do not seem to repeat once addressed incongruent interrogatives and push a K- participant who expresses strong unknowing stances (cf. Markee, 1995, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). The K+ participant invites the K- participant to do L2 learning, and if aligned with, the participants orient to changing the K- participant's status from K- to K+ through a form of self-repair, in cooperation with each other.

An aspect that appears to be part of how participants invoke the reciprocal roles of the L2 teacher and the L2 learner and use incongruent interrogatives as part of doing L2 learning is that the learning object is primarily oriented to as being within the K+ participant's epistemic domain. Thus, the participants are in epistemically asymmetric positions in relation to each other and the oriented-to, co-constructed learning object regarding L2 knowledge. These roles are, in other words, interactionally talked into being and oriented-to by both participants. The role of epistemic status in the production and recognition of learning as social action in-and-through the use of incongruent interrogatives appears to be of significant importance in conjunction with the

linguistic design of the turns when understood by the participants in the social interaction (Heritage, 2013). Incongruent interrogatives have been criticized as dispreferred (Slotte-Lüttge, 2005) or as not being authentic or 'communicative' (Christoph & Nystrand, 2001; Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Gibbons, 1998; Markee, 1995; Nystrand, 1997), and some research has argued that the use of known-answer questions prevents rather than supports learning (Markee, 2004). However, with a perspective on L2 learning as action that participants do and orient to, it appears that the incongruent interrogative is specifically designed and used by the participants to initiate specific forms of practices and perform L2 learning as social action. In other words, incongruent interrogatives appear to be part of the business (e.g. teaching and instructing) of the talk-in-interaction in pedagogical institutions and learning contexts, both in teacher- and student-centered activities.

The purpose of the analysis was to discover the methods and practices the participants employ to produce and understand L2 learning as social action and make the practices explicit. The results indicate that incongruent interrogatives are recurrent, specifically situated in a sequence, and attract distinctive responses, which distinguish them from related or similar conduct, such as repair practices. The incongruent interrogatives, as they are used in the situations analyzed for this article, appear to be recognizable to the recipients by what social action the speaker intends to accomplish, which is indicated by the recipients' responses that indicate an orientation toward a learning object in the L2 and toward changing the recipients' knowledge of the L2 learning object there and then. In sum, the actions that doing learning comprises include (among possible others) initiating an instructional sequence (including a proposal of epistemically asymmetric statuses) and aligning or disaligning that leads to either an answer (to the interrogative) or abandonment of the project.

4.2 Conclusion

One of the generally acknowledged contributions of CA to the study of human sociality is the ability of the approach to empirically ground its claims in observable action. One of the foundational resources for the emic CA analysis is the next-turn proof procedure (Sacks et al., 1974, pp. 728–729). In short, CA claims that talk-in-interaction has a built-in procedure for how participants are to explicate their understanding of the ongoing talk. This is, it is argued, "a systematic consequence of the turn-taking organization of conversation that it obliges its participants to display to each other, in a turn's talk, their understanding of other turns' talk" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 728).

The empirical grounding of learning has been, and continues to be, a substantial challenge. The particular contribution of this study, to meet these challenges, is to show how a certain kind of question works in peer-to-peer instruction. We believe the analysis has shown how participants in certain epistemic configurations can initiate a learning sequence by asking an incongruent interrogative. The outlining of a recently undescribed instructional action is a valuable finding. However, how the practice is taken up, and developed, by the recipient makes the analysis presented here relevant beyond interaction analysis.

In line with the basic assumption of a next turn proof procedure in CA, the recipient of an incongruent interrogative is required to display in his or her next turn his or her understanding of the preceding turn. We have analytically proposed that asking the incongruent interrogative proposes a learning orientation and—in line with the sequential analysis—what happens next is that the recipient has to align or disalign with the format proposed by the incongruent interrogative. Depending on the uptake, the interaction takes different paths with learning orientation following aligning responses and disaligning. Thus, the systematics of turn-taking in these situations provide resources for participants to inform each other, through social practices,

whether or not to do learning. When doing so, they also provide resources for the learning researcher to empirically grasp learning as a socially accomplished phenomenon in social interaction. Not only as a principal feature of interaction, or as something assumed to follow certain actions in certain conditions, but also as a phenomenon that can (and has been here) shown to be either present or not, depending on the participants' sequentially organized practices, made available to the analyst through resources that are "intrinsic to the data themselves" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 729). Incongruent interrogatives are a limited phenomenon, and the scope of the claims made here should not be over-extended. However, we believe that for a field looking for ways to locate learning-in-action rather than learning-in-outcomes, a small and limited empirical contribution can be of principal value.

References

Aijmer, K. (1997). I think – an English modal particle. In T. Swan & O. Jansen Westvik (Eds.), *Modality in Germanic languages – Historical and comparative perspective* (pp. 1–47). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Antaki, C. (2013). Recipient-side test questions. *Discourse Studies, 15*(1), 3–18.

Back, M. (2016). Epistemics and expertise in peer tutoring interactions: Co-constructing knowledge of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(2), 508–521.

Brammerts, H. (2003). Språkinlärning i tandem och inlärarautonomi. Om utvecklingen av ett concept [Language learning in tandem and learner autonomy]. In B. Jonsson (Ed.), *Självstyrd språkinlärning i tandem. En handbok* [Self-regulated language learning in tandem. A handbook] (pp. 13–22). Härnösand: Department of Humanities, Mid Sweden University.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(10), 1439–1465.

Carroll, D. (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 201–220). London, England: Continuum.

Čekaite, A. (2006). *Getting started. Children's participation and language learning in an L2 classroom* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Drew, P. (1981). Adults' corrections of children's mistakes: A response to Wells and Montgomery. In P. French & M. MacLure (Eds.), *Adult-child conversation: Studies in structure and process* (pp. 244–267). London, England: Croom Helm.

Drew, P. (2012). What drives sequences? *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 61–68.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). Common Knowledge: The Development of Joint Understanding in the Classroom. London: Methuen.

Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (Eds.). (2006). *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford, England: Berg.

Evaldsson, A.-C., & Sahlström, F. (2014). Metasociolinguistic stance taking and the appropriation of bilingual identities in everyday peer language practices. In A.-C.

Evaldsson & F. Sahlström (Eds.), *Children's peer talk. Learning from each other* (pp. 149–168). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(Focus Issue), 800–819.

Gardner, R. (2012). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593–611). West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gibbons, P. (1998). Classroom talk and the learning of new registers in a second language. Language and Education, 12(2), 99–118.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics, 46*, 8–23.

Hall, J. K. (1997). A consideration of SLA as a theory of practice: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 301–306.

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 511–526.

Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development.* Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hargreaves, E. (2012). Teachers' classroom feedback: Still trying to get it right. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *7*, 1–15.

Heinemann, T., Steensig, J., & Lindström, A. (2011). Addressing epistemic incongruence in question-answer sequences through the use of epistemic adverbs. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 107–130). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hellermann, J. (2005). Interactional practices for creating cohesion in series of three-part sequences in classroom talk. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *38*(1), 105–130.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(2), 113–132.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2012). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370–394). West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (2012b). Beyond and behind the words: Some reactions to my commentators. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 76–81.

Heritage, J. (2012c). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 1–29.

Heritage, J. (2012d). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(1), 30–52.

Heritage, J. (2013). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, *15*(5), 551–578.

Jakonen, T. (2014a). *Knowing matters: How students address lack of knowledge in bilingual classroom interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Jakonen, T. (2014b). Building bridges: How secondary school pupils bring their informal learning experiences into a content and language integrated (CLIL) classroom. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *8*(1), 7–28.

Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(1), 73–94.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Benjamins.

Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *66*, 86–105.

Karjalainen, K. (2011). *Interaktion som mål och medel i FinTandem – Strategier och orientering vid problem i språkproduktion* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Vaasa, Vaasa, Finland.

Karjalainen, K., Pörn, M., Rusk, F., & Björkskog, L. (2013). Classroom tandem – Outlining a model for language learning and instruction. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *6*(1), 165–184.

Kärkkäinen, E. (2006). Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk*, *26*(6), 699–731.

Karlsson, S. (2006). *Positioneringsfraser i interaktion* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 11–36.

Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *43*(2), 183–209.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277–309.

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

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(1), 180–206.

Lee, Y.-A. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text & Talk*, *30*(4), 403–422.

Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes*, *19*(1), 111–131.

Lilja, N. (2010). *Ongelmista oppimiseen* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.

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

Lindström, J. (2008). *Tur och ordning: Introduktion till svensk samtalsgrammatik* [In turns: Introduction to Swedish conversational grammar]. Stockholm, Sweden: Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.

Löf, Å., Koskinen, H., Pörn, M., Hansell, K., Korhonen, A., & Engberg, C. (2016). *Klasstandem - En resa över språkgränsen. Luokkatandem - matka yli kielirajan* [Classroom tandem - a cross-linguistic trip]. Vaasa, Finland: Åbo Akademi.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268–285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's learning lessons reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*(1), 239–280.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33,* 703–736.

Margutti, P. (2006). "Are you human beings?" Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, *17*, 313–346.

Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *43*, 315–345.

Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 63–92.

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

Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 583–596.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(iv), 491–500.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7*, 183–213.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349–377.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Melander, H. (2012). Transformations of knowledge within a peer group. Knowing and learning in interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 1*(3–4), 232–248.

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

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

Pallotti, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 1–16). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

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

& C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising "learning" in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Tainio, L. (2014). Asymmetries of knowledge and epistemic change in social gaming interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(4), 1022–1038.

Pyle, D., Pyle, N., Lignugaris/Kraft, B., Duran, L., & Akers, J. (2016). Academic effects of peer-mediated interventions with English language learners: A research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 1–31.

Radford, J., Blatchford, P., & Webster, R. (2011). Opening up and closing down: How teachers and TAs manage turn-taking, topic and repair in mathematics lessons. *Language and Instruction*, *21*, 625–635.

Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, *35*(5), 677–705.

Rusk, F., & Pörn, M. (2013). Epistemisk positionering som en del av andraspråkslärande i social interaktion [Epistemic positioning as part of second language learning in social interaction]. In M. Eronen & M. Rodi-Risberg (Eds.), *Point of view as challenge* (pp. 315–326). Vaasa, Finland: VAKKI.

Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016a). Whose question? Whose knowledge? Morality in the negotiation and management of L2 knowledge in a communicative L2 program. In A. Surian (Ed.), *Open spaces for interactions and learning diversities* (pp. 151–166). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016b). The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. *Classroom Discourse, 7*(2), 184–205.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696–735. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/412243.

Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as social action. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 43–62). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Sahlström, F., Forsman, L., Hummelstedt-Djedou, I., Pörn, M., Rusk, F., & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2013). *Språk och identitet i undervisning - inga konstigheter* [Language and identity in teaching - nothing strange]. Stockholm, Sweden: Liber.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *The American Journal of Sociology, 102*, 161–216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse and Society, 10*, 577–582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 3–31.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Seedhouse, P., & Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising "learning" in applied linguistics* (pp. 127−146). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

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

Sidnell, J. (2012). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77−99). West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Sjöholm, K., & Björklund, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Content and language integrated learning. Teachers' and teacher educators' experiences of English medium teaching.* Vaasa, Finland: Åbo Akademi.

Slotte-Lüttge, A., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2012). Learning how to be a tähti: A case study of language development in everyday situations of a 7-year-old multilingual Finnish child. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *17*, 153−173.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L., & Steensig, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The morality of knowledge in conversation.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 171−185.

Tanner, M. (2014). *Lärarens väg genom klassrummet* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Karlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden.

Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research, 4*(2), 161–178.

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational Psychology, 25*(6), 631–645.

Turnbull, M., & Saxton, K. L. (1997). Modal expressions as facework in refusals to comply with requests: I think I should say "no" right now. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27*, 145–181.

Wagner, J. (2010). Learning and doing learning in interaction: What do participants do in everyday out-of-school second language talk? In Y. Kite & K. Ikeda (Eds.), *Language learning and socialization through conversations* (pp. 51–59). Osaka, Japan: Kansai University, Center for Human Activity Theory.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language),6*(1), 1–14.

Waring, H. Z. (2012). Yes–no questions that convey a critical stance in the language classroom. *Language and Education*, *26*(5), 451–469.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied linguistics, 21*(1), 244–267.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, *17*(2), 89–100.

Notes

[1] For example, when teachers initiate repair in the next turn after a student's trouble source, the teacher's response is correction, not repair (McHoul, 1990, p. 374). The student's answer contains an error, which is corrected.

[2] The translation of the transcripts is not idiomatic. Instead, it is an attempt to replicate the wording, prosody, and way of speaking used by the participants in the situations transcribed (Bucholtz, 2000; Temple & Young, 2004). The transcription conventions are adapted from Jefferson (2004) and Hepburn and Bolden (2012).

```
(.)          a micropause less than 0.2 seconds
(0.5)        a silence indicated in tenths of seconds
[text]       overlapping talk or co-occurring embodied actions
text         stress or emphasis
TEXT         louder talk than normal
°text°       markedly quiet talk
:            prolongation/stretching of the prior sound
>text<       faster talk than normal
<text>       slower talk than normal
text-        cut-off or self-interrupted talk
((text))     non-verbal/embodied activity/transcriber's description of events
(text)       likely hearing of talk
(Si) / X     the identity of speaker is not clear
(    )       inaudible
=            talk/embodied activity latches on previous turn
@text@       animated voice
#text#       creaky voice
?            rising intonation
.            falling intonation
,            continuing intonation
hh (hh)      hearable exhale
.hh (.hh)    hearable inhale
text         English translation of Finnish in italics
text         English translation of Swedish in bold font
```

[3] When we use the term "task," we are referring to an assignment that is written on a sheet of paper the teacher handed out to the participants to complete.