



Title	Teacher-Initiated Semantic Language Play Through Negotiation of Deontic Status
Author(s)	Kikuchi, Haruka
Citation	大阪大学言語文化学. 2023, 32, p. 133-152
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/91162
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Teacher-Initiated Semantic Language Play Through Negotiation of Deontic Status *

Haruka KIKUCHI **

キーワード : teacher-children interaction, language play, focus on form

近年広がりを見せるコミュニケーション型言語教育において、教師は子どもたちに目標言語を暗示的に楽しく学習させ、言語学習に様々な感情を伴わせることが期待されている。教室内相互行為においてそれを実現する方法の一つが言葉遊びである。一般的な教室ディスコースの研究に比べ、言語学習への阻害要因としても捉えられる言葉遊びの研究は未だ数が少ない。しかし、先行研究では子どもたち主導の言葉遊びがL2学習環境において言語形式への着目(focus on form)を引き出し、多人数会話への参加枠組みを形成することが明らかになってきた。

では、教師はどのような言葉遊びを用いて、L2言語能力の限られた子どもたちを言語学習へ導いていくのか。この問い合わせに答えることで、言語教師が子どもたちの楽しいL2学習を支援するための相互行為方法の実装に貢献することを本研究の目的とし、日本の英語学童保育の幼稚クラスにおける教師と子どもたちの相互行為を撮影したビデオデータを対象に、第二言語習得のための会話分析(CA-for-SLA)を用いて分析を行った。本研究ではリサーチクエスチョンを以下の通り設定した。(I) どのような手続きで教師主導の言葉遊びが達成されるのか、(II) 教師主導の言葉遊びによって引き起こされる相互行為はどのようなものか。

結果、(I)に関して、教師は一時的に教室のモラルを逸脱してみせることにより言葉遊びを開始し、子どもたちにその逸脱を継続して注意させることで言葉遊びを延長するという手続きが示された。更に、これによって注意のための言語形式に子どもたちを指向させ、言語学習に繋げる手続きが(II)の結果として示された。また、教師による言葉遊びが新たな教室活動開始のための参加枠組みを形成する手続きや、数分前の言葉遊びの連鎖が別の状況下で再利用されることによって、子どもたちが注意のための言語学習をパフォーマンスする場を提供し得ることが分かった。

教師による言葉遊びは暗示的で感情を伴った言語使用及び学習の機会を与えることができる。教師にはどのような言語形式や相互行為が子どもたちによって楽しいものだと

* 幼児英語教室での象徴遊びにおける教師の義務的ステータス交渉(菊池春花)

** 大阪大学人文学研究科言語文化学専攻博士後期課程

指向され、継続して再利用されることで学習機会を提供できるのかを見極める能力が必要である。

1 Introduction

Playfulness in early English education is increasingly regarded as a key element in children's learning outcomes considering their innate talent to learn intrinsically about their surroundings with joy and affection (Halliwell, 1992). As classroom members use the target language not merely as an object of explicit instruction but also a medium of communication (Seedhouse, 2004), playful classroom interaction is worth assessing as an everyday resource in language learning.

However, as fun is often considered an obstacle to learning, research on classroom interaction has focused on learning outcomes through more conventional interactional patterns, but scarcely analyzed playful language learning (Sullivan, 2000a). In addition to the existing research, a few yet growing numbers of studies have examined the construct of more ludic classroom settings.

Previous literature has provided evidence that playful interaction, whether teacher- or learner-initiated, can mediate learners' *focus on form* (FonF) episodes, in which learners display orientation to linguistic elements in use, language learning, and discourse participation (cf. Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004, 2005). However, the following questions remain: How is playful interaction initiated by the teacher when working with novice learners not competent enough to elaborate ludic second language (L2) use? In addition, how, if at all, can it lead to language learning?

Based on Conversation Analysis (CA), this study exemplifies a teacher-initiated playful interaction through which the teacher withholds their expert identity. This study argues that such a playful exchange mobilizes children's stance-taking responses in disapproval of the teacher's non-expert identity, and charges children with an interactional responsibility to demand the teacher return to their expert identity. Particularly, this study suggests that the stance-taking response can involve language learning and emphasizes that teachers' playful interactions can be an important interactional repertoire for language teachers to elicit FonF, enhance classroom management, and offer a learning performance opportunity for young novice learners.

The present article reviews the literature on language play (LP) and introduces the *deontic status* concept (Stevanovic, 2013). Next, the present study's data and methodology

are explained. Further, three LP examples in a real classroom setting are analyzed. Lastly, the conclusions, discussion, and pedagogical implications are presented.

2 Literature review

2.1 Theoretical research on language play

According to Cook (2000), LP is broadly defined as an activity in which language use is associated with enjoyment. Cook (1997, 2000) categorizes LP into three levels: *formal*, *semantic*, and *pragmatic*. Formal LP utilizes sounds and grammatical forms, including rhymes and puns (Cook, 1997). Semantic LP entails reference to a fictional world as well as separation from the real world—e.g., *make-believe* (i.e., playing out roles of characters in interaction; Cook, 2000). Lastly, pragmatic LP is exercised through social awareness—e.g., the pursuit of intimacy or aggression among the interlocutors.

Along with the premise of LP as an entertaining activity, its positive effects on first language learning cannot be ignored, namely, LP serving as a device for FonF. While rhymes drive children's attention to phonetic sounds, those who begin to use verbatim repetition of linguistic resources are focused on wordings and syntactic forms (Cook, 1997). When older children engage in riddles, a metalinguistic awareness of the ambiguity and obscurity of words is required (Cook, 2000; Crystal, 2001).

The present study closely examines semantic LP and FonF in a language classroom setting. Although the theoretical argument presented above does not guarantee the impact of LP in each language learning episode, it helps identify LP as a resource for language learning in children's everyday interactions. Building on those theories, in the following section, several studies are reviewed to examine children's LP interactions in language classrooms to address the following question: if any language learning is to happen, in what ways may LP entail such a moment?

2.2 Playful interaction in language classrooms

Motivated by Cekaite and Aronsson's (2005) call for taking "non-serious language more seriously" (p.169), several scholarly works have illuminated learners' skillful engagement in playful interactions with limited linguistic resources.

Cekaite and Aronsson (2004) investigated playful repetition among immigrant students in grades 1–3 at a Swedish immersion school. They maintained that children focused on who produces certain utterances and how, and posited that recycling

utterances is a method to display interactional alignment; thus, they formulated a participation framework. Another study at the same school investigated LP as a trigger for extended multiparty interaction (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005). For children, LP attracted the attention of other classmates; consequently, it facilitated a collaborative focus on linguistic form. Studies on adult L2 learners also suggested LP as a device for orientation to a non-default identity (e.g., a mother instead of a learner) as well as a trigger for various non-official discourse types (Waring, 2012) and non-default *voices* (Bushnell, 2007).

Additionally, two studies on teacher-initiated joking suggested that LP elicits learners' playful utterances and assists in vocabulary expansion (Sullivan, 2000a, 2000b). Both studies exemplified how FonF was accomplished in the process of building rapport.

As indicated, empirical studies on young learners' LP usages have emphasized their competence in taking advantage of the linguistic resources immediately at their disposal, as well as the impact of LP on language learning. However, these empirical studies exclusively targeted learner-initiated LP, or teacher-initiated LP for adult learners, whereas the role of teacher-initiated LP on children's L2 learning remains relatively unexplored. In the following section, the concept of *deontic status* (Stevanovic, 2013) is introduced to discuss the construct of teacher-initiated LP shown in the data.

2.3 Deontics in language classrooms

Stevanovic (2013) defines *deontic rights* as the potential power possessed by an interlocutor within a certain domain of action vis-à-vis their co-interlocutor. Participants who utter a request, for example, negotiate the asymmetrical distribution of deontic rights with their interlocutor by selecting modal verbs, directives, or interrogation, thereby influencing their future course of action (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012; Stevanovic, 2013). Closely related to the concept of deontic rights is that of deontic status, which comprises "the deontic rights that a certain person *has* in a certain domain, irrespective of whether they momentarily *claim* these rights or not" (Stevanovic, 2013, p.26; italics in the original).

Ishino and Okada (2018) provided a more specific definition of deontic status for language learners as "each student's expectancies for their course of action" (p.3). Their study demonstrated how the teacher's address terms for a particular student can construct their particular deontic status, which makes the teacher's subsequent actions relevant to the student's constructed deontic status. Following Ishino and Okada (2018), this study aims to apply a deontic status to the teacher, defining the expectations for the course of

action possessed by children and the teacher themselves. The present study discusses how the teacher's deontic status is oriented by children in the classroom and how it can be a resource for semantic LP.

3 Research questions

In contrast to the previous literature focused on learner-initiated LP, the present study investigates the role and the characteristics of teacher-initiated LP in an actual children's language learning setting. The research questions are as follows:

- (I) What procedures are employed to achieve teacher-initiated LP?
- (II) What are the interactional consequences of teacher-initiated LP?

4 Study

4.1 Recordings and data

The present data was video-recorded in an English immersion afterschool program in Japan and transcribed according to the transcription convention by Jefferson (2004) and Mondada (2018). From a total of 364 minutes of recorded interactions, playful interaction during the *Circle Time* activity is highlighted. Circle Time is a worldwide activity for preschoolers; it aims to promote children's sense of belonging to a community and cultivate social and communicative skills (Yazigi & Seedhouse, 2005). The video recordings show the children interviewing each other to share information about themselves, their well-being, and learning social circle via songs and picture books.

The participants included one Japanese female teacher and four children (excluding one child sleeping at the table). At the time of the recording, the teacher had 5.5 years of experience at the school and had been acquainted with the children since their first day at the school. Her training history included a monthly program on basic childcare and child development (designed by the same school), as well as on-the-job training in classroom management. The children's information is provided in the table below.

Table 1: Participant information

Name (Pseudonym)	Gender	Age	Years of Learning
Shinjiro	Male	5	2
Marika	Female	4	1
Hazuki	Female	4	1
Eri	Female	3	0.5

4.2 Methods

This study employs CA, a systematic analytic approach to unveil structure and order in actual mundane interaction (ten Have, 2007). It does so by revealing the meaning making methods used by ordinary people across contexts, and also by identifying how those methods can be context-sensitively adjusted (Kasper & Wagner, 2011).

Conversation analytically speaking, language learning is understood as learning the methods to participate in L2 interactions while making sense of other interlocutors (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). The present study especially deploys CA-for-SLA (Second Language Acquisition) for learning analysis, that is, instead of relying on exogenous theories, the focus is placed on the children's socially distributed cognition (i.e., their knowledge status) that becomes available in the ongoing interaction to the interlocutors, as well as the analyst and the readers (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). This brings the argument back to the first statement, CA as a systematic analysis of talk-in-interaction. When CA analyzes an utterance, the resource to judge its meaning is the participants' orientation to the utterance which becomes revealed in subsequent turns (Okada, 2010).

It should be noted that, in contrast to nomothetic approach, CA takes a hermeneutic approach that treats the (segments of) data as a specimen of teacher-initiated LP episodes, but not a sample or reflection of all the similar events (Okada, 2010; ten Have, 2007). CA thus does not attempt to test a hypothesis and lead to a general account of how languages are taught, but aims to understand the actual figure of interaction *per se* (Okada, 2010). When a social action in question is observed in the data, the procedures of the action are generalizable not in a distributional sense, but rather in a sense that they are possible and thus reproducible (Okada, 2015; Peräkylä, 1997). The detailed description of the interactional order, therefore, allows the readers to access what procedures are needed to reproduce the particular type of social action (Peräkylä, 1997). With this account of generalizability as possibility in the hermeneutic discipline in mind, the present study aims to help expand the interactional repertoires of language teachers in similar contexts

(Okada, 2015).

5 Analysis

5.1 Extract 1.1: Teacher, wake up

The following extract shows the interaction during activities' transition into Circle Time. The learners sit next to each other to form a line with the teacher in front. The extract begins when the teacher started to act as if she was falling asleep (line 7).

The teacher's role as a turn-taking administrator in the classroom has been a staple in conventional classroom discourse studies (e.g., Seedhouse, 2004). However, the data displays that the teacher disrupts conventional classroom dynamics by "falling asleep," which functions as an elicitation technique for children's L2 use. The extract demonstrates how this LP consists of the teacher's double performance of not *doing being a teacher* (Richards, 2006), which comprises the following actions: (1) temporal withholding of the teacher's identity, and (2) downgrading her *epistemic stance*, referring to the knowledge status claimed by the action design in turns (Heritage, 2012). Subsequently, the step-by-step construction of collaborative FonF through these two elements is illustrated.

(T/t=Teacher, H/h=Hazuki, M/m=Marika, E/e=Eri, S/s=Shinjiro, ss=students; same in all extracts)

7 T: *↑A↓A::↑A↓A::↑A↓A::
 t: *pretends to fall asleep-->
 8 *#(2.9)
 t: -->
 ss: *stand up, surround T -->
 fig. #1




fig.1

```

9  H: ¥teacher¥=
h: ¥moves hands to each syl¥
t: -->
ss: -->
10 M: =[$teacher$]
m: $bends knees to each syl$
11 E: [teacher
t: -->
ss: -->
12   (0.7)
t: -->
ss: -->
13 M: [TEACHER
14 H: [TEACHER
15 S: [TEACHER
16 E: [TEA%CHE%R
e: %stomps%
t: -->
ss: -->
17   (.)
t: fake sleep from line 7-->*
ss: -->
18 T: Øteacher what?
t: Øgaze at ss-->
ss: -->
19   (0.5)Ø * (0.8)
t: -->Ø *pretends to fall asleep -->
ss: -->
20 E: %TE [ACHER%
e: %stomps at each syl%
21 M: [$TEACHER (.) teacher°teacher° $§
m: $stomps five times
t: -->§
ss: -->
22   (0.5)*
t: -->*
ss: -->
23 T: teacher teacher teacher *z:::::
t: *pretends to sleep-->
ss: -->
24 M: [TEACHER
25 H: [TEACHER
26 E: [TEACHER
27 S: [=TEA*CHER=
ss: #tap T's upper body +
t: -->+
28   (0.5)
ss: -->
29 T: Øwhat
t: Øgaze at ss-->
ss: -->
30   (0.6)
t: -->
ss: -->
31 T: wa:ke ↑u↓:p?
t: -->
ss: -->
32 M: wa[ke up ]
33 T: [wake up]
34 H: [wake up]
35 E: [wake up]
36 S: [wake up]=
t: -->
ss: -->

```

37 T: =>oh okay okay< teacher (name) wake upΦ
 t: -->Φ
 ss: -->

In response to the teacher falling asleep, H, followed by M and E, summon her and initiate a *corrective sequence* that sanctions an inappropriate action in the classroom (Jacknick, 2021). As Craven and Potter (2010) point out, the teacher's non-compliance to their call (lines 12, 18, 19, 23) leads to the children's repeated, upgraded summonses, along with an increased volume, stomping, and taps (lines 13–16, 20–21, 24–27). Here, the interactional organization of the teacher's non-compliance must be examined vis-à-vis its impact to highlight the phrase "wake up." First, her question "teacher what?" (line 18) evinces her unknowing epistemic stance regarding the reason for their summonses (Heritage, 2012), thereby highlighting the children's need to name the desired action: "wake up." Secondly in line 23, the teacher falls asleep while displaying her understanding of the upgraded nature of their directive by repeating their calls. Therefore, her turns are designed to highlight the empty slot for the missing action verb by demonstrating that although their upgraded summonses are certainly heard, they are insufficient to wake her up. When the candidate directive is suggested ("wa:ke u:p?"; line 31), the children exhibit orientation and repair their sanction. The *change of state token* ("oh"; Heritage, 1984) in line 37 indicates the teacher's renewed epistemic stance, which displays her understanding of the reason for their summons. Consequently, the children's success in waking the teacher up is attributed to their own efforts, rather than her words (line 31).

In this extract, the participants perform semantic LP as they engage in make-believe by attempting to wake the teacher (Cook, 2000). It is also evident that collaborative discourse participation is shaped by the children's repetition of each other's utterances (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004).

The first construct of this LP is the temporary withholding of the teacher's situational expert identity demonstrated by displaying herself as someone who does not follow or is ignorant of conventional classroom rules (line 7; Zimmerman, 1988). Expressly, she temporarily renounces her *deontic status* as a teacher (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012). This mobilizes the children's stance-taking which disproves her seemingly illegitimate action; therefore, this LP charges the children with an interactional responsibility to self-initiate a corrective sequence to resume the legitimate participation framework (lines 9–16; Jacknick, 2021). This process is additionally demonstrated by how the children are

discharged from the chairs and allowed to surround and tap the teacher, while stomping their feet, thereby marking a shift from the on-task interactional style.

The impact of this corrective sequence on language learning is shown after line 18 (“teacher what?”). After withholding her expert identity (line 7), the teacher simultaneously downgrades her epistemic stance regarding the reason for the children’s summonses, which is argued to be the second resource for FonF. Heritage (2010) demonstrated that sequence expansion occurs when the questioner in talk takes an unknowing stance; similarly, the teacher is successfully sustaining the children’s orientation to the ongoing activity (lines 20–21, 24–27). Therefore, when the phrase is finally suggested in interrogative prosody not specifically designed for repetition (line 31; Girgin & Brandt, 2019), the children instantly display their orientation to the learning object and repeat it collaboratively (lines 32–36), even when stating “yes” would have been an easier option. Thus, this sequence illustrates how collaborative FonF is achieved in a step-by-step manner. In the local context of this classroom, the teacher is able to (a) direct the children’s orientation to linguistic form, (b) sustain their orientation, and (c) have them use the form for an authentic communicative purpose by using the two resources.

Building on the impact of teacher-initiated LP on FonF illustrated above, the following extract shows that the LP in Extract 1.1 is successfully interpreted as a joke and recycled into a learner-initiated LP, as well as teacher-initiated LP as a mediator for classroom transition.

5.2 Extract 1.2: Hazuki, wake up

This extract begins 12 seconds after Extract 1.1 ends. After waking up, the teacher attempts to move on to the first activity and notices Hazuki falling asleep (begins before line 51) in an identical manner to the teacher in the previous extract.

In this section, it will be argued how the previous teacher-initiated LP is incorporated into the children’s actions, displaying their competence to initiate semantic LP. Further, it investigates the role of LP as the teacher’s classroom management technique.

```

51 T: *so >everybody< (0.3) * *what's* number=
t: *walks to in front of ss* *claps *
h: >> pretends to fall asleep -->
52 T: =ΦE::: #hazuki wake £[↑up£Φ *hahahahaha* .hh
t: Φgaze at H Φ *claps *
fig: #2

```




fig.2

53 H: [hh¥
h: -->¥

54 (0.5)

55 T: \$↑oh \$ Ø>e<
m: \$leans back\$
t: Øgaze at m-->

56 (0.7)
t: -->

57 T: %↑marika sleepy?%
e: %leans to Rside %
t: -->

58 \$ (0.4) \$ Ø
m: \$shakes head\$
t: -->Ø

59 T: Ø¥>E< ↑eri sleepy?=br/>t: Ø gaze at E -->
h: ¥pretends sleeping -->

60 E: ehhh %h[hh%
t: -->
e: %shakes head%
h: -->

61 T: [*e? can teacher (name)
t: -->
t: *.....
h: -->

62 T: tickle tickle [tickle?
63 E: * [%u: hhhh↑hØ*%
t: -->Ø
t: *fingers directed to E, walks to E-->*
e: %stands up to escape%
h: -->

64 Ø%* (0.3)
t: Ø gaze at H-->
t: *.....
e: %.....
h: -->

65 T: *can teacher (name) tickle%*¥
t: -->
t: * fingers directed to H, walks to H-->*
e: %.....
h: pretending sleeping from line 59 -->¥

66 T: *>[tickle tickle?<*Ø
t: --> Ø
t: *tickles H -->*

67 H: ¥[hhhh¥
h: ¥hands against TY

68 Ø(0.3)
t: Ø gaze at S-->

```

69 T: >*what about< shinjiro sleepy?
t: -->
t: *fingers directed to S, walks to S-->
70 (0.4) +(0.3) +(0.2)
t: -->
t: -->
s: +shakes head+
71 T: *ah safe* ♀
t: -->♀
t: *,,,,,,*
72 (0.4)
73 T: >♀* are you sleepy?<
t: ♀ gaze at M -->
t: *fingers directed to M, walks to M-->
74 $ (0.5) *♀$
m: $shakes head$
t: -->♀
t: -->*
75 T: £NO:£ (.) okay then everybody
76 T: can you *sta:x::nd * *banaxna *
t: *rolls hands* *jumps, standing arms up*
ss: *.....* stand up, arms up->>

```

Despite a *transitional marker* to the next sequence (“so, everybody”; Walsh, 2006), H is caught falling asleep, which is followed by the teacher’s correction with laughter and a clap (“wake up”; line 52). Combined with H’s subsequent laugh (line 53), they are mutually oriented to this exchange to be *laughable* and playful (Glenn & Holt, 2013). This exchange continues with other children, as M (line 55) and E (line 57) are caught in recumbent positions. While M denies the question by shaking her head (line 58), E’s affiliative response indicates her understanding of the playful nature of this interaction (line 63). Subsequently, the teacher attempts to tickle the “sleepy” children playfully (lines 61–62, 65–66, 69, 73), with which H and E again affiliate (lines 63 and 67). After confirming that the other two children responded otherwise (lines 70 and 74), the teacher resumes the flow of the lesson with another transitional marker.

For this extract, it is first necessary to assess Hazuki’s competence to recycle and initiate semantic LP from the previous extract. Combined with her laughable orientation, she deviates from classroom morals by misaligning with the teacher’s interactional and pedagogical moves shown in her transitional marker (line 51), skillfully displaying her illegitimate participation stance (Jacknick, 2021). In this term, Hazuki’s joking evinces her understanding of *conditional relevance* between the two actions; sleeping in the classroom conditionally invites correction (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Her competence to mobilize correction initiation (namely, stating “wake up”) for a playful purpose suggests that she is a skillful initiator of semantic LP.

The teacher’s subsequent tickling sequence comprises additional semantic LP, as the

participants are again displaying affiliation with the fake affective stance. Here, the role of LP as a mediator of classroom transition is investigated. Although it is performed in a playful manner, as demonstrated by the teacher's friendly tone and the children's laughter (lines 60, 63, 67), the teacher's tickling serves to sanction the sleeping children in the classroom (Jacknick, 2021). By reclaiming her *deontic authority* which, in this case refers to the teacher's potential power to determine the future course of the children's actions (Stevanovic, 2013), the teacher is attempting to resume the flow of legitimate classroom management. She proceeds to tickle the next child only after confirming that the target child is either properly sanctioned, as E and H, or not showing a sleepy affective stance, as S and M. This one-by-one sanction/confirmation secures the legitimate participation status of all the children, thereby collaboratively generating a starting point for the next activity (lines 75–76). As Macbeth (2000) argues that classroom discourse is a stage on which participants' knowledge status is performed visually to all the classroom members, this finding suggests that semantic LP is also a theater for the organization and performance of each child's legitimate participation status. Although the existing literature focused on how off-task LP can facilitate language learning, this analysis illustrates semantic LP as a mediator of the transition from off-task to on-task interaction.

The following extract demonstrates semantic LP as an interactional space for children to recycle and perform their learning.

5.3 Extract 1.3: Froggy, wake up

This extract was filmed approximately 7 minutes after Extract 1.2. In the ongoing Circle Time lesson, the children interviewed each other by asking "How are you?" After all the children had their turn, the teacher requested them to ask a toy frog (referred to as Froggy hereafter) in her hand the same question (line 184).

```

183 T: well ↑one more time (.)
184 T: can you say #how are y↑ou:#?
      t:           #points at toy at each syll#
185   (0.4)
186 M: [HOW ARE YOU?
187 H: [HOW ARE YOU?
188 E: [HOW ARE YOU?
189 S: [HOW ARE YOU?
190 T: ↑i::m (1.1) °sleepy°+ ((toy voicing))
      t:           #lays the toy on Lhand#
191   (0.7)
192 S: +[wake up+
      s: +upper body directed to toy+

```

193 M: \$[(wake) #up\$
 m: \$upper body directed to toy\$
 fig: #3



fig.3

194 T: #WAKE UP== ((toy voicing))
 t: #wakes toy body up #
 195 H: =wake up
 196 T: <°#sleepy#°> ((toy voicing))
 t: # lays the toy on Lhand #
 197 M: [WAKE UP
 198 H: [WAKE UP
 199 E: [WAKE UP
 200 S: * [WAKE UP*
 ss: *body directed to toy *
 201 # (0.5) # # (0.3)
 t: # wakes toy's body up --># #lays it again-->
 202 T: °sle[epy°# ((toy voicing))
 t: -->#
 203 E: [%WAKE [UP%=
 e: %upper body directed to toy%
 204 H: [WAKE UP]
 205 T: [#u::[::::::]:p# i see i see#
 t: #.....# wakes toy body up#
 206 (1.0)
 207 T: hey (0.3) can i have a b↑e↓:d? ((toy voicing))

After receiving a collaborative response to her request (lines 186–189), the teacher lays Froggy on her left hand and produces the trouble source “I’m sleepy” by enacting Froggy’s voice. S and M initiate a correction towards this, smiling (“wake up”; lines 192–193). Although the teacher aligns by waking Froggy’s body up with a repetition of the phrase once (line 194), line 196 shows an instance of non-compliance, which mobilizes an upgraded collective directive (lines 197–200; Craven & Potter, 2010). This is repeated in line 202, to which E and H respond in a louder volume (lines 203–204). Overlapping with their call, the teacher produces a prolonged “up” while waking Froggy’s body, subsequently acknowledging their calls (“I see, I see”). After line 207, the children engage in “cleaning up” Froggy yet in a playful way, as M and H prepare a chair for it to sleep on (out of the extract).

The present analysis highlights that teacher-initiated semantic LP offers a learning

performance opportunity for children. Once again, this interaction comprises another case of semantic LP because the interlocutors respond to the teacher's imaginatively acted role as Froggy. Here, the children's pragmatic competence to appropriately use the established target phrase ("wake up") in a renewed context is observed. Unlike Extracts 1.1 and 1.2, in which the trouble source relied exclusively on a non-verbal fake-sleep posture, in line 190 the trouble source is multimodally demonstrated with the utterance and laying posture ("I'm sleepy"). Additionally, Froggy, as a third person, does not receive a straightforward categorization either as a child or a teacher (Sacks, 1972). Therefore, applying the learned phrase for correction in a renewed context challenges the children's pragmatic competence. First, they must categorize Froggy as a classroom member and apply deontic status to him to expect a legitimate participation status (Jacknick, 2021). Second, they are required to use the learning object in response to the verbal utterance "I'm sleepy," without the teacher's support. For children, it is only by precisely recycling the target phrase, but not in any other form (e.g., "Froggy!" or "don't sleep"), that they can demonstrate their learning outcome. In sum, this semantic LP, as a stage for learning performance, is partly recycled from the activity in Extract 1.1; nevertheless, it evolves into a new sequence that mobilizes the children's higher pragmatic skills (Goodwin, 2018).

6. Concluding discussions

The present study investigated the construct and interactional consequences of teacher-initiated semantic LP activities for young novice L2 learners, thereby addressing the two research questions: (I) "What procedures are employed to achieve teacher-initiated LP?" and (II) "What are the interactional consequences of teacher-initiated LP?"

Extract 1.1 demonstrated that semantic LP comprised the teacher's violation of classroom moral expectation via (1) the temporal withholding of her teacher identity and (2) her downgraded epistemic stance relative to the children. Consequentially, this led to the claim of teacher-initiated semantic LP as an initiator of FonF. Building on Kasper and Burch's (2016) research that demonstrated the close ties between FonF and the interlocutors' category-bound obligation (such as an L1 speaker being more knowledgeable about the language than a learner), this study maintains that the reversed category-bound action (the teacher sleeping) draws the children's orientation to the teacher's deontic status, which leads them to invoke their FonF as a means of retrieving the category-bound action of the teacher.

Extract 1.2 showed two semantic LP episodes. Hazuki's LP consisted of recycling the teacher's previous action, thereby displaying her skillful orientation to the misbehavior sanction conditional relevance. Most importantly, her competence illustrates young novice learners' ability to engage in L2 interaction for fun. Further, the teacher's tickling LP was a result of her retrieved deontic status, precisely, reclaiming her legitimate right to sanction the sleepy children. This study suggests that semantic LP as a means of classroom transition for young children is one legitimate strategy in teachers' classroom management skills repertoire.

In Extract 1.3, while the basic structure of the LP was recycled from the previous exchanges, it also exhibited new contextual elements that required the children with a higher pragmatic competence to initiate a corrective sequence. Consequently, teacher-initiated semantic LP functioned as a space for the children's learning performance.

Based on these findings, this study yields important implications regarding teachers' LP implementation. As Extracts 1.2 and 1.3 demonstrated, the teacher's fake sleeping and the corrective phrase "wake up" were repeatedly deployed and recycled by the children, thereby serving as fundamental resources for their learning. For a specific episode of LP to be fun and learning-relevant, the teacher as an LP initiator must sensitively organize and adjust their language use; in other words, they must have an *interactional awareness* of what form, meaning, and level of linguistic resources can be incorporated into children's speech and possibly recycled into subsequent exchanges (Walsh, 2006). Despite the LP's nature as an off-task event, each LP episode involving learning is not merely a random collection of fictive language use, but is rather systematically designed to be language learners' *affordance*; an environment with language learning resources (Van Lier, 2000).

Lastly, the present study especially claims its relevance to the work by Houen et al. (2018). Their assertion that teachers' downgraded expert stance in questions elicits children's agentic participation is supported and also expanded by the present study in a way that this procedure is also possible in semantic LP, and that the participation can involve language learning. It is hoped that this study encourages language teachers' LP implementation that makes children's learning experiences both fun and meaningful.

Acknowledgements

The author is highly grateful to my supervisor Dr. Yusuke Okada, an associate professor at Osaka University, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful advice on an earlier

draft of this article. I also thank Ms. Akie Fukushima and Ms. Sha Kinyou for their meaningful comments on the analysis during the data session. This work was supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2138.

References

Bushnell, C. (2007). "Lego my keego!": An analysis of language play in a beginning Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 49–69. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm033>

Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2004). Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: Playful recyclings in an immersion classroom. *Discourse Studies*, 6(3), 373–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445604044295>

Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2005). Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh042>

Cook, G. (1997). Language play, language learning. *ELT journal*, 51(3), 224–231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.3.224>

Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies*, 12(4), 419–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610370126>

Crystal, D. (2001). *Language play*. The University of Chicago Press.

Girgin, U., & Brandt, A. (2019). Creating space for learning through "Mm hm" in a L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse*, 11(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1603115>

Glenn, P., & Holt, E. (2013). Introduction. In P. Glenn & E. Holt (Eds.), *Studies of laughter in interaction* (pp. 1–22). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge University Press.

Halliwell, S. (1992). *Teaching English in the primary classroom*. Longman.

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

Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), "Why do you ask?": *The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 42–68). Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684>

Houen, S., Danby, S., Farrell, A., & Thorpe, K. (2018). Adopting an unknowing stance in teacher-child interactions through “I wonder...” formulations. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1518251>

Ishino, M., & Okada, Y. (2018). Constructing students’ deontic status by use of alternative recognitionals for student reference. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(2), 95–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1407947>

Jacknick, C. (2021). *Multimodal participation and engagement: Social interaction in the classroom*. Edinburgh University Press.

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

Kasper, G., & Burch, A. R. (2016). Focus on form in the wild. In R. van Compernolle, & J. McGregor (Eds.), *Authenticity, language, and interaction in second language contexts* (pp. 198–232). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095315>

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117–142). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203830932>

Macbeth, D. (2000). Classroom as installations: Direct instruction in the early grades. In H. Stephen, & D. Francis (Eds.), *Local educational order* (pp. 21–71). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.73>

Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(1), 85–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413878>

Okada, Y. (2010). Role-play in oral proficiency interviews: Interactive footing and interactional competencies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1647–1668. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.002>

Okada, Y. (2015). Identity ni yoru shakudoka: Gengo kyoshi no teishikika tetsuduki no kaiwa bunseki kenkyu [Scaling on identity: A teacher’s formulation procedure in language classroom talk]. *JALT Journal*, 37(2), 147–170.

<https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ37.2-3>

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. (pp. 201–220). Sage Publications.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 51–77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami041>

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (3rd ed., pp. 225–238). Routledge.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50008-2>

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell Publishing.

Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(3), 297–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.699260>

Stevanovic, M. (2013). *Deontic rights in interaction: A conversation analytic study on authority and cooperation* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki]. Helsingin yliopisto.

Sullivan, P. (2000a). Spoken artistry: Performance in a foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 73–90). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sullivan, P. (2000b). Playfulness as mediation in communicative language learning teaching in a Vietnamese classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 115–131). Oxford University Press.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J.P. Lantolf. (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245–259). Oxford University Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711>

Waring, H. Z. (2012). Doing being playful in the second language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams047>

Yazigi, R., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). "Sharing time" with young learners. *TESL-EJ*, 9(3), 1–26.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87–106). Sage Publications.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions and abbreviations

(0.0)	time gap between utterances
(.)	time gap less than 0.19 second
=	latching utterances with no intervals in between
[]	beginning and end of overlapping utterance
()	uncertain transcription
:	stretched vowel sound
?	rising intonation
↑	high pitch on the next utterance
↓	low pitch on the next utterance
h	outbreathing sound
.h	inbreathing sound
<u>under</u>	emphasized utterance
> <	the words inside are rapidly produced.
< >	the words inside are slowly produced.
£word£	the words inside are produced in laughter.
° word°	the words inside are quietly produced.
WORD	the words are loudly produced.
* *	Participants' embodied actions continue between the two symbols. (one symbol per participant's line of action)
*—>	The movement continues
—>*	until another symbol is reached.
>>	The action begins before the extract.
—>>	The action continues over the extract.
fig	A screenshot of a particular moment of the conversation
#	is inserted when this symbol appears.
Lhand	Left hand
Rhand	Right hand
Rside	Right side
syl	syllable