



ENABLING LANGUAGE HELP: EPISTEMIC MANEUVERING IN EXTENDED INFORMATION REQUEST SEQUENCES BETWEEN EFL TEACHERS

Christopher LEYLAND¹

Abstract: Recent years have seen an upsurge in interest in epistemics/knowledge in interaction (e.g. Heritage, 2012a, 2012b; Stivers, Mondada & Steensig, 2011). Insights from such research are now being used by Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers yielding valuable insights into teacher-student interaction (e.g. Sert, 2013) and student-student interaction (e.g. Jakonen & Morton, 2013). The current study, however, tracks how teachers use other teachers as language learning resources. Conversation Analysis (CA) is used to examine English language learning sequences in Japanese high school staffrooms between English L1 and L2 speaker teachers, namely JET Programme Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) and Japanese teachers of English (JTEs). This study reveals that the relationship between the information request and subsequent provision of help is not a straightforward one. Information requests in this study are particularly lengthy multi-turn collaborative processes that see the use of various interactional tools used and careful epistemic manoeuvring to equip the prospective helper with the knowledge necessary to provide help. This process ends when the recipient is able to provide the necessary information - with a ‘penny-drop moment’ frequently given. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of epistemics in SLA, and adds a layer of complexity to our understanding of epistemics in interaction.

Keywords: Conversation analysis, second language acquisition, epistemics, social relations, information requests

Özet: Son yıllarda etkileşimde bilgiselliğin yeri üzerine olan ilgide bir artış görülmektedir (örneğin, Heritage, 2012a, 2012b, Stivers, Mondada & Steensig, 2011). Bu araştırmalar son yıllarda ikinci dil edinimi alanındaki araştırmacılar tarafından kullanılmaktadır ve öğretmen-öğrenci (örneğin, Sert, 2013) ve öğrenci-öğrenci (örneğin, Jakonen & Morton, 2013) etkileşimleri üzerine önemli çıkarımlar sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma öğretmenlerin diğer öğretmenlerden birer dil öğrenme kaynağı olarak nasıl yararlandıkları ile ilgilidir. Japon liselerindeki öğretmenler odalarında İngilizce’yi birinci ve ikinci dil olarak kullanan öğretmenlerin, yani JET Programı Asistan Dil Öğretmenlerinin ve Japon İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin, dil öğrenme dizilerini incelemek için Konuşma Çözümlemesi kullanılmaktadır. Bu araştırma bilgi talebi ile devamındaki yardımın arasındaki ilişkinin direkt olmadığını ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Bu çalışmada bilgi talepleri özellikle çok konuşma sıralı işbirlikçi süreçlerdir ve yardım sunmak için gerekli bilgiyi potansiyel yardımcıya sağlamak adına çeşitli etkileşimsel araçları ve tedbirli bilgisel manevraları içermektedir. Bu süreç, ‘jeton düşme anı’ ile birlikte, alıcının gerekli bilgiyi sağlamasıyla son bulmaktadır. Bu araştırma ikinci dil edinimindeki bilgisellik anlayışına katkı sağlamaktadır ve etkileşimdeki bilgisellik anlayışımıza bir katman daha karmaşıklık eklemektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Konuşma çözümlemesi, ikinci dil edinimi, bilgisellik, sosyal ilişkiler, bilgi talepleri

1. Introduction

As Drew (2012) states, recent years have seen “new life” (p. 61) breathed into in the study of epistemics in talk-in-interaction. Through a Conversation Analysis (CA) lens, epistemics is seen as the claims and expressions of knowledge and their various functions in interaction. Important studies by Heritage and Raymond (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Raymond & Heritage, 2006; Heritage, 2012a) examine how speakers display orientations to their own and their interlocutor's rights and access to knowledge in various domains. In particular, Heritage made the “immensely influential” (Drew 2012: 61) claim that when someone indicates a lack of knowledge, a sequence is triggered that runs until this knowledge is seemingly obtained, with participants achieving a state of epistemic equilibrium on a particular matter. This ‘epistemic engine’ is claimed to be the driving force behind interactions (Heritage, 2012b). In recent years insights into epistemics have been utilized by SLA researchers using CA, uncovering various interactional practices and phenomena in the classroom that serve to push forward our understanding of knowledge in interaction. For

¹ Postdoctoral researcher, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Kobe University, Japan, christopherleyland@hotmail.com

example, valuable research has been carried out considering epistemics in teacher-student interactions (Kääntä, 2014; Sert, 2013; Sert & Walsh, 2013) and student-student interactions (Jakonen & Morton, 2013). What is less well known is the interactional management of knowledge in teacher-teacher interactions. This study draws upon over 80 hours of recordings between English language ‘team-teachers’ in Japanese high school staffrooms. It identifies the common practice of one English L2 speaker asking the English L1 speaker for English language-related help and uncovers the complex interactional work and epistemic maneuvering that is undertaken in order to enable language help to be given. By uncovering and discussing the processes in which one language professional uses another language professional for their own language learning, this study adds new dimensions to the bank of epistemics research. Additionally, this study uncovers the school staffroom as another “perspicuous setting” (Garfinkel, 1967) in which L2 learning occurs, enabling us to “expand our general stock of knowledge of L2 learning and L2 acquisition” (Firth, 2009: 131).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Epistemics

CA researchers have shown the ways interactant’s turn formulation reflects both their own claims of knowledge (with different levels of certainty) and what they consider their interlocutor(s) to know (e.g. Drew, 1991; Stivers et al, 2011). These knowledge claims and assumptions are considered the beginning of knowledge-related identity negotiations. Such formulations can tap into “a presupposed or agreed upon...state of affairs” (Heritage, 2012a) or can be treated as highly contentious and open up lengthy negotiations (see Mondada, 2009). As such, rather than being a static entity ‘owned’ by an individual, access to knowledge is shown to be a dynamic concept organized by participants in talk-in-interaction.

The study of knowledge has been long established. Shannon and Weaver’s ‘Mathematical Theory of Communication’ (1949) was particularly influential for cognitive science research on knowledge. Here, knowledge is information turned to language and sent from one individual to another to be digested in its original form. Since the 1980s, however, there have been calls to further consider “the processes through which knowledge is managed socially” (Stivers et al, 2011:5, emphases added). However, it is only relatively recently that the CA community has shown much engagement with knowledge-related research (Heritage, 2012b).

In 2010, Stivers & Rossano developed the notion of ‘epistemic domains’, stating that interlocutors use various methods to mark something as residing in one’s ‘epistemic domain’ to different degrees. For example, Hayano (2013) notes that Japanese speakers use the turn ending item ‘yo’ to mark something as residing within a domain in which they have primary access. Accounting for access to knowledge within epistemic domains, Heritage (2012a) demonstrates that interactants “occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient (more knowledgeable [K+] or less knowledgeable [K-])” (p.4). Researchers have tracked how K+ status can be highly challengeable. Focusing on car dealer-customer interactions, Mondada (2009) saw both interlocutors making car-related assessments and thus claiming K+ status. Their assessments were frequently either upgraded or downgraded by the other, occasioning lengthy negotiations.

Accounting for the ways participants design their talk and modulate the extent of rights to knowledge, Heritage developed the notion of ‘epistemic stance’ (2012a). By uttering ‘Are you married?’, the speaker proffers no knowledge of the recipient’s marital status - giving an ‘unknowing stance’. If uttering ‘You’re married, aren’t you?’, a somewhat ‘knowing’ stance is shown, orienting to the possibility of the recipient being married. Finally, ‘You’re married’ represents a ‘best guess’, frequently prompting the recipient’s confirmation and indicating a rather ‘knowing’ stance (Raymond, 2010). Heritage (2010) finds that while a turn with an ‘unknowing’ stance frequently results in an expanded sequence, turns with a ‘knowing’ stance commonly result

in quick sequence closure. In recent years there has been considerable work on epistemic stance markers. Kärkkäinen examined the functions of the epistemic downgrade ‘I think’ (2003) then ‘I guess’ (2007), and Weatherall (2011) considered how a turn-initial ‘I don’t know’ in first position assessments downgrades its epistemic veracity and displays “that the speaker is less than fully committed to what follows” (p.317). Relatedly, Park (2012) claims that South Korean university students’ prepositioned epistemic hedges invoke the teacher’s epistemic primacy and advice-giving.

One fundamental claim in Conversation Analytic research is that for turn taking to occur in an orderly fashion, participants are constantly monitoring the ongoing talk (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Recently, Heritage (2012b) develops this by claiming that in this process participants constantly monitor each other’s talk for signs of epistemic status asymmetries. Their occurrence triggers sequences that run until the asymmetries are equalized. This interactional driving force is what Heritage describes as the ‘epistemic engine’. Heritage (*ibid*) examined sequences initiated by expressions of K+ and also K- status. He points to a pre-sequence to a story or announcement as being a typical case of a sequence being triggered by an expression of K+ status. This is the first step of a sequence which will typically run until the new information is shared and digested. Information requests are a very common expression of the deliverer’s K- status. Additionally, the first-pair parts of information requests place the receiver in a relative K+ status position. After the sought-after information is delivered in the second-pair parts, the requester commonly treats the prior turn as an ‘informing’ in the third position.

2.2. Information Requests

Heritage (2002) states “the ways in which questions are designed unavoidably serve to index the relationship between questioner and the respondent” (p.204). In response, Raymond has produced a body of research to understand the relationship between the grammatical and prosodic form of information requests, the responses they garner and the social/epistemic relations embedded in information request-assertion sequences (2000, 2003, 2010). This understanding serves as a key to “understanding the ways that institutions shape the conduct and lives of the people caught up in them” (Raymond, 2010: 87).² Much of this research pays particular attention to the design of specific forms of information request. A brief review of some common forms follows below.

‘Yes/No interrogatives’ (hereon YNIs) (Raymond, 2003) are a very common grammatical form of information request. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik (1985) state that YNIs “are usually formed by placing the verb/operator before the subject” (p. 807), for example ‘do they do the cooking for barbecues?’ (Gardner, 2012). Depending on the polarity markers within the YNI, a yes, no or equivalent token is the preferred form of response. While the above YNI example has the positive polarity marker ‘do they?’, a question like ‘you don’t have asthma do you?’ (Heritage, 2010) contains the negative polarity marker ‘don’t’ - thereby creating a preference for a ‘no’ response. People typically use YNIs to “treat the matters formulated in their initiating action as in question and thereby claim not to know the “answer” as a basis for making an answer relevant” (Raymond, 2010: 92). This sets up a preference for the ‘correctness’ of the matter in question to be (dis)confirmed³ by the recipient. By directing this seemingly unknown matter to another party, the YNI deliverer invokes an epistemic status asymmetry of themselves as K- and the recipient as K+.⁴

² It is important, however, to make clear the distinction between ‘questions’ and ‘information requests’. Although the communicative function of a question is typically associated with a ‘interrogative morphosyntax’, various syntactic forms ‘do questioning’. Similarly “not all interrogatives perform the communicative function of questioning” (Ehrlich & Freed, 2010:4). As such, utterances that function to obtain information will be termed ‘information requests’ rather than ‘questions’ (Schegloff, 2007; Kim, 2013).

³ From hereon, I will use ‘(dis)confirm’ as shorthand for ‘confirm or disconfirm’. See Stivers and Hayashi, 2010.

⁴ An exception. Stokoe & Edwards (2008) identify the practice of ‘asking silly questions’ using the YNI form by policemen during suspect interrogations. For example, ‘Did you have permission to smash your neighbour’s door’. Here, while the polarity marker is a positive one, the content of the YNI seems to generate an expectation of a negative (no) response.

Raymond's consideration of YNIs and the preference structure they set up has since been utilized in a considerable body of research (e.g. Butler, Potter, Danby, Emmison, & Hepburn, 2010; Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Stokoe, Benwell & Attenborough, 2013).

'Yes/No declaratives' (YNDs) typically place the subject before the verb to make some form of assertion (with declarative syntax) (Quirk et al, 1985: 814). YNDs can be composed of positive or negative polarity with rising or falling intonation. For example, "and your tail end's okay" (Raymond, 2010: 93). Here, deliverers assert matters and therefore, unlike YNIs, they claim a certain degree of knowledge. However, as this sets up a preference for the receiver's confirmation, the YND deliverers orient to the recipients superior access and rights to the content. Consequently, YNIs are a form of 'B-event statement' (Labov & Fanshel, 1977) that claim some knowledge but ultimately cede epistemic primacy to the recipient. Raymond's work on YNDs too has been widely used (e.g. Park, 2012; Wilkinson, 2011; Heritage, 2010).

Raymond (2010) finds that although YNDs frequently trigger a single-turn response, YNIs are often expanded beyond their second-position response with, for example, an assessment from the YNI deliverer. As such, YNIs tend to prompt more accountability than YNDs (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994; Raymond, 2000; Park, 2012). YNI/YND forms set up distinct bases for responses and the forms they take. Raymond (2010) finds that health nurses while making home visits alternate between YNIs and YNDs based on their projections of how much they and the recipients know. They use YNDs when considering themselves to have some knowledge (although treating the receiver as having more) (e.g. 'and he's a builder'), and use YNIs when they consider the recipient to hold more knowledge (e.g. 'did you have a good pregnancy').

Another common form of information requests are "'Wh" type interrogatives': those that start with words such as "who," "what," "when". These are also frequently used when seeking to prompt a response about a person, place, or a time in the form of a description or explanation (Raymond, 2003: 944). Compared to YNIs and YNDs, the grammatical construction of "'Wh" type interrogatives are more 'open' (Wang, 2006). They prompt the introduction of information from the 'more knowledgeable' recipient (Mishler, 1984), and thus make relevant some form of epistemic asymmetry.⁵ Research has found "'Wh" type interrogatives commonly used by teachers when giving 'known information questions' to students (e.g. Koshik, 2002), while other research has shown doctors use "'Wh" type interrogatives when seeking to obtain new information from patients (e.g. Mishler, 1984). 'Alternative questions' (Quirk et al, 1985) see the deliverer provide two or more alternatives and set up an expectation for the recipient to choose one or more (see Englert, 2010: 9). Koshik (2005), for example, finds alternative questions are used for one participant to give two possible hearings of some prior utterance, so as to achieve clarification.

Considering the responses to information requests indicate the ways in which recipients respond to the restrictions and epistemic orientations of the first pair part. Although they may give conforming responses (e.g. Heritage, 1998), there are various ways in which the recipient can break from these restrictions. For example, focusing on Japanese and English conversations, Stivers & Hayashi (2010) saw the use of 'transformative answers' in which the recipient (dis)confirms the correctness of another question to that which he/she received. By doing this the question recipient proposes a change in the agenda of the sequence initiated by the previous request. Kim (2013) considers the ways in which Korean speakers depart from the constraints of questions and reshape the trajectory of the talk in the turn-initial space. In addition, the recipient of an information request may treat orientations to their K+ status as being problematic. The recipient may resist with a claim of insufficient knowledge such as "I don't know" (Beach & Metzger, 1997; Sert & Walsh, 2013) or by uttering some other "no-access" response (Heinemann, Lindström, & Steensig, 2011).

⁵ Additionally, Koshik (2003) identifies the common practice of "'Wh" type interrogatives being used as 'rhetorical questions'. Here, a response is not made relevant.

As this review indicates, making information requests and providing information in return are paired social actions. People use different grammatical forms in order to obtain particular information. These forms also display the deliverer's orientation to the identities and expertise of the recipient, which the recipient can accept, reject or negotiate. Of critical importance is that understanding the nature of such sequences can provide an insight into institutional realities and the relationships between its members (Raymond, 2010). The following section reviews literature considering epistemics in a range of second language learning contexts.

2.3. Epistemics and Second Language Acquisition

Since their publication, Heritage's 2012 studies have served as a reliable point of departure for epistemics-related studies. In particular, there is a small but growing body of CA research focusing on Second Language Acquisition contexts (CA for SLA, see Markee & Kasper, 2004) utilizing epistemics insights and providing further understanding of knowledge in interaction. Analyzing English conversations between Korean adolescents and an American 'native speaker' of English in various non-classroom settings, Kim (2012) identifies certain interactional practices that create language learning opportunities. For example, following a rather lengthy description by the L2 speaker, the L1 speaker will provide a name for the description. In doing so, the L1 speaker references his/her recognition and understanding of the talk and undergoes language teaching.

By examining teacher-student interactions in a second language classroom, Sert (2013) identifies the teacher's recurrent use of 'epistemic status check' (ESC) (e.g. 'no idea?' and 'no?') directed to a student. Teachers here treat students' delayed provision of an adjacency pair second-pair part and other non-verbal cues (such as gaze withdrawals and headshakes) as displays of insufficient knowledge. These displays then prompt the teacher's ESC who then allocates a turn to another student. As such students' K- epistemic status displays are important resources for the teacher to make use of so as to move the classroom activity forward. Kääntä (2014) too examines teacher-student interactions in the language classroom, considering how students' embodied interaction functions to display their states of knowledge, thus triggering language correction sequences. Jakonen & Morton (2013) extend the consideration of classroom epistemics by shifting the focus of attention from teacher-student interactions to student-student interactions. They see that claims of K- status commonly prompt the practice of Epistemic Search Sequences (ESSs). Here, during group tasks, students work together, using each other as potential sources of knowledge needed to resolve collective gaps in L2 knowledge (e.g. spelling and vocabulary). Typically, a student complying with a K+ status treatment means they are usually held accountable for what they claim to know, yet they frequently downplay any possible negative perceptions of having such K+ status. These CA for SLA studies make use of recent epistemics thought and push it forward by examining language expert-novice, teacher-student and student-student interactions.

Several Asian countries have government sponsored school programmes, employing English 'native speaker' (NS) teachers to 'team teach' along with domestically trained usually host-national English teachers, such as South Korea's 'English Programme in Korea' (EPIK) and Japan's 'JET Programme'. This is a growing phenomenon in Asia, with the JET Programme, for example, starting in 1987 with around 850 English NS teachers and growing to around 4300 in 2013. These NS teachers on the JET Programme are 'Assistant Language Teachers' who are to provide whatever work-related assistance the Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) require, such as teaching preparation, extra-curricular activities, and language assistance (see McDonnell, 2000). While there has been a small amount of research considering the nature of team teacher-student interaction in the classroom (e.g. Horii, 2012; Aline & Hosoda, 2006; Hosoda & Aline, 2012), there has been no research considering interactions between team teachers. As such, the current study takes teacher-teacher interaction as its site of exploration. It focuses on the social distribution of knowledge, in particular second language knowledge, in (team) teacher-teacher interactions. How do language learning opportunities arise? How are requests for language help successfully achieved? How is

language help successfully achieved? This paper argues that there are phenomena evident in information request sequences in this data that have not yet been accounted for in CA for SLA research. An understanding of such phenomena will further inform CA for SLA thought and will contribute to a more holistic view of how knowledge is organized in interaction.

3. Method and Data

The method used in this study is conversation analysis (CA). This long established empirical methodology has been used to uncover and examine the details and organization of talk (and other conduct) in interaction (see Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). The data for this study originate from a corpus of around 80 hours of audio recordings of naturally occurring talk in two Japanese high school staffrooms. Participants are Japanese national teachers of English (JTEs) and JET Programme assistant language teachers (ALTs) from the UK and US. The researcher identified and examined the recurring practice of JTEs requesting English language-related ‘help’ from the ALT. It emerged that each such encounter consists of a patterned sequence of actions. First; the JTE requests some form of English language assistance, second; the ALT provides some form of English language assistance, and third; sequence closure. These sequences are primarily conducted in English, however, JTEs also occasionally use Japanese. Where Japanese occurs there will be English idiomatic translations in italics below. As the participants in this data do not share a first language, at any one time a participant will be using a second language. Consequently, the data in this study can be considered Second Language Interaction (SLI) data (see Kurhila, 2006).

4. Data Analysis: The ‘native speaker’ team teacher as a language resource

In this section I will examine three naturally occurring sequences in which JTEs seek and obtain English language-related ‘help’ in various ways. As with the research reviewed above on information requests, this section will examine the interactional contexts in which the information requests occur, their grammatical and prosodic ‘packaging’, the social relations they index, and how they relate to the subsequent provisions of information. The JTEs in the extracts below are named Aya and Aoi, while the ALTs are Bev (from the US) and Ben (UK).

Extract 1

Just prior to this extract, Aya (JTE) explains to Bev (ALT) that she is writing a letter in English to some friends in Canada. When Aya asks how to express that she wants to maintain contact with them, Bev states that ‘keep in touch’ is a phrase she could use. However, Bev states that it is a rather formal phrase. In lines 1-3 below Bev starts an assessment of ‘keep in touch’ before Aya shifts the focus.

```

1      Bev  >it would be< R::EALLY (.) ° i- its like° (0.3)=
2      Aya  =°.hhh >huh<°(.)=
3      Bev  =°>you [have to take<°]
4 → Aya      [ do: ↑you say ] (.) q↑uality peo↓ple
5          (1.0)
6      Bev  °↑th-° THEY are a QUALITY of- quality
7          [per:↑son (.) °yeah°]
8      Aya  [ so >that MEAN ]S<
9          (1.0)
10     Aya  PER:son or PEO:ople who::: >are very n↑ice<=
11     Bev  ↑uh huh=
12     Aya  =>And<
13          (1.5)
14     Aya  >you want to k↑eep in touch ↓with<
15          (1.5)
16     Bev  YE::AH=
17     Aya  =(inaudible)=
18     Bev  =uh- UH::M

```

19 (1.4)
 20 Aya *tatoeba:=*
for example
 21 Bev =°.hhh°=
 22 Aya =for exam-
 23 (1.0)
 24 Aya i- >it was< (0.3) n- n::nice m::eeting:↓::
 25 (1.6)
 26 Aya °>nan to iu kana?<°
how should I say it?
 27 (1.0)
 28 Aya °hmm↓::° (.) >it was n↑i:ce< to::
 29 (1.4)
 30 Aya h- have (.) me°t::°
 31 (1.5)
 32 Aya a >quality< person like ↓you:
 33 Bev UH [HUH?]
 34 Aya [is this] (.) is that (.) makes sense? DOES that
 35 make sens[e?]
 36 Bev [↓Y]EAH
 37 (0.5)
 38 Bev yeah that's okay
 39 Aya oka:y

In line 1 Bev is in the process of delivering an assessment related to ‘keep in touch’, Aya overlaps in line 4 and takes the floor with ‘[do: ↑you say] (.) q↑uality peo↓ple’. As this utterance does not relate to Bev’s prior talk yet does initiate a new sequence, it sees Aya issuing a ‘disjunctive topic shift’ (Schegloff, 2007). This disjunctive topic shift takes the form of a ‘question-formatted’ utterance, indicating that Aya cuts of one assertion by requesting another, thereby treating Bev’s completion of the previous assessment as unnecessary. The grammatical formulation of Aya’s Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) in line 4, with the operator/verb then subject (Quirk et al, 1985: 801), and its turn-ending rising intonation marks it as being a YNI which requires the recipient to check if it ‘correct’ or not (Raymond, 2003). By providing the formulation ‘quality people’, yet seeking Bev’s (dis)confirmation, Aya claims uncertain knowledge and displays an orientation to Bev’s relative K+ epistemic status. As this relates to an English formulation and its use, the epistemic domain in question is related to English language use. As such, Aya ends one English language related explanation (seemingly unfinished) by triggering another. Reflexively, Aya takes up the identity of an L2 speaker of English whose competence has occasional limitations.

Despite Aya’s turn in line 4 making Bev’s response relevant, a 1.0 second gap of silence follows in line 5. Following this delay Bev does take the floor and while she identifies the item in question, Bev’s cut-offs and restarts indicate that she is unable to provide any confirmation, marking this a dispreferred second-pair part (Pomerantz, 1984). As such, more work is required to enable Bev’s help. In response, Aya overlaps with the declaratively-formed ‘[so >that MEAN]S<’ in line 8, proposing some form of clarification work. Following another 1.0 second silence in which the interactional floor appears to be open, Aya continues with more topical talk in line 10. By uttering ‘PER:son or PEO:ople who::: >are very n↑ice<’ Aya continues her overlapped clarification by giving a description of ‘quality person/people’. Following Bev’s ‘continuer’ in line 11, Aya continues and adds further description with ‘>you want to k↑eep in touch ↓with<’ in line 14. Here, Aya clarifies her referent, i.e. what kind of person a ‘quality person’ is. After a 1.5 second gap with no more of Aya’s descriptions forthcoming, Bev utters a clear agreement token ‘YE::AH’ in line 16. However, following a short, undecipherable utterance from Aya in line 17, Bev latches with ‘uh- UH::M’ in line 18, followed by a 1.4 second pause. While

Bev takes and holds the floor here, the following silence suggests she doing an acknowledgment that hands the floor back to Aya. As such, more interactional work is required to enable Bev's help.

In line 20, Aya code-switches to Japanese with '*tatoeba*: (for example)' to propose an example. Aya soon switches back to English with the cut-off 'for *exam*-' - reissuing her proposal. Then follows a pause before Aya utters 'i- >*it was*< (0.3) n- n::*nice* m::*eeting*:↓::' in line 24. The perturbations here appear to indicate that Aya is 'doing thinking' (Houtkoop-Stenstra, 1994) while holding the floor to generate relevant topical talk. Then in line 26 Aya code-switches to Japanese, uttering '°>*nan to iu kana?*<° (how should I say it?)', indexing her difficulty in producing appropriate talk. The 1.0 second silence in line 27 with no talk from Bev suggests her orientation to Aya's continuation. Then in lines 28 to 32, despite long gaps of silence, Aya utters 'it was nice to have met a quality person like you'. As such, Aya's turn in line 26 represents a self-repair initiator, in which she cuts off one formulation and produces another. In this second formulation Aya places her 'in question' phrase (quality person) into the context of a sentence.

In response, Bev utters 'UH [HUH?]' in line 33. This sees Bev indicate an apparent comprehension of Aya's talk yet with (dis)confirmation given of formulation, Aya overlaps with '[*is this*] (.) *is that* (.) *makes sense?* DOES that make sens[e?]'. Here, Aya shifts from delivering the item in a sentence to delivering a question to decipher the 'correctness' of the formulation. This represents the end of Aya's clarification process and a direct call for help in the form of a YNI. Additionally, this represents a slight shift in Aya's focus, from wanting to know if 'quality people' is something that 'you say' (line 4) to wanting to know if a formulation containing 'quality person' 'makes sense'. Here, while Aya orients to having enough English language knowledge to provide a formulation, by treating its correctness as needing confirmation, Aya treats Bev as having relative K+ status.

As this is followed by Bev's confirmation that the sentence does indeed make sense, which is accepted by Aya, this represents the completion of her information request turn. Bev's overlapped '[↓*Y*]*EAH*' in line 36 clearly and emphatically confirms the 'correctness' of Aya's formulation and provides an action- and type-conforming SPP. By confirming, Bev displays an unproblematic treatment of being placed in the K+ position in the English language. Bev then gives another confirmation which is accepted by Aya's 'o*ka:y*' in line 39 which draws this sequence to a close.

Extract 1: Summary

Aya's turn in line 4 ('do you say quality people') is made up of question-syntax. Using this YNI format Aya claims the knowledge that 'quality people' might be correct, yet by necessitating Bev's confirmation of its correctness, Aya orients to Bev's epistemic status primacy. Consequently, despite initial orientations to this epistemic status differential, the actual demonstration of Bev's K+ epistemic status in the form of a confirmation, which would equalize the asymmetry on this particular matter, requires considerably more work (descriptions (lines 8-14), an example (20-32), then another YNI (34-35)). Here, to enable the enactment of a participant's K+ status (in the form of providing help) it is necessary for the relative K- status participant to tap into their access to this epistemic domain so as to adequately inform the prospective 'helper' of what form the required help should take. This process necessitates an extended stretch of talk. Extract 2, below, also shows an extended process to enable the enactment of one's K+ status.

Extract 2

Just prior to the extract below, Aya and Bev have been discussing a student's English language diary entry. Bev explains that rather than using the 'passive voice' the student should have used the 'active voice'. Then the transcribed talk below begins.

- 1 Aya °↑uh::↓m::°
 2 (0.8)
 3 → Aya °↓sou ↑ne:° (0.3) >so< ↑how: can you <sa:↓:y> (0.6)
that's right
 4 a:↓h:: (0.4) >i don't know how to say this in english<
 5 (.) >though< (0.5) she:: passed >the test?<
 6 (0.8)
 7 Bev ↑uh huh?
 8 (1.1)
 9 Aya on (0.5) ↑ON (0.5) ↑BY (0.5) ↑IN (0.4) thirty six
 10 (0.3)
 11 Aya her ↑sco:re was thirty six [↑and] it >was=
 12 Bev [a°h:-°]
 13 Aya =↑JUst< a pass ([°?°])
 14 Bev [>↑WE] say< ↑WITH a THIRTY SIX
 15 (.) [I] ↑PA- °i-°=
 16 Aya [ah]
 17 Aya =↑WITH
 18 Bev =↓ye:ah
 19 Aya ↑with a score of thi[rty ↓six]
 20 Bev [i: PA]SSed the score with
 21 °uh:° with a ↑thirty ↓six=
 22 Aya =↑with (0.3) ↑AH (a)
 23 Bev with AH: (a) (.) ↑thirty ↓si:x
 24 Aya ↑AH:
 25 (0.5)

Following her agreement tokens ‘°↑uh::↓m::°’ and ‘°↓sou ↑ne:° (*that's right*)’, Aya utters the ‘transition marker’ ‘>so<’ in line 3 and moves to a new topic with ‘↑how: can you <sa:↓:y>’. Here, Aya begins the delivery of a question-formulated utterance, thus starting a new topic. The use of the lexical item ‘↑how:’ gives it a “‘wh-” type interrogative”⁶ (Raymond, 2003) format, and by adding ‘can you <sa:↓:y>’, Bev makes relevant an explanation of a way/ways of saying something. This is followed by gaps of silence and a filled pause which delay the pragmatic completion of the request. However, by starting this information request, Aya clearly places herself in a relative K- status position in some domain.

In line 4, Aya utters ‘>i don't know how to say this in english<’. While functioning to delay the delivery of Aya’s information request, by giving this ‘claim of insufficient knowledge’ (CIK) (Beach & Metzger, 1997; Sert & Walsh, 2013) Aya claims to have an ‘unknowing’ stance in an English-language epistemic domain and draws attention to her perceived English language difficulty. Aya’s CIK also functions as an ‘epistemic hedge’ (Weatherall, 2011) that prefaces her following formulation, beginning in line 5, with uncertainty: ‘she:: passed >the test?<’. Aya’s turn-ending rising intonation and subsequent silence provides Bev the space to utter ‘↑uh huh?’ in line 7. By giving this continuer, Bev indicates an unproblematic treatment of Aya’s as-yet-incomplete talk. This response appears to support Heritage’s (2012a) claim that when information is considered to be within the current speaker’s domain (i.e. Aya’s delivery of her own request), rising intonation is heard as their continuing and can prompt a continuer. As such Bev’s continuer indicates her orientation to the necessity of Aya to continue her information request.

⁶ Not all ‘wh-type interrogatives’ begin with ‘wh’. Questions beginning with ‘how’ can also be considered ‘wh-type interrogatives’ (Schegloff, 2007: 78).

In line 9 Aya takes the floor and loudly utters the prepositional items in raised intonation ‘↑ON’, ‘↑BY’, ‘↑IN’, before uttering ‘thirty six’. Aya is drawing attention to the prepositions and their close placement to ‘thirty six’ suggests that she is designing them as three ‘possibly correct’ prepositions. By producing, over two turns, the formulation ‘she passed the test on, by, in thirty six’, Aya claims a good deal of English language knowledge yet orients to her occasional limitations with regards to prepositions. Aya then quickly retakes the floor and again shows good English language knowledge by producing full sentence including ‘thirty six’: ‘her ↑score:re was thirty six [↑and] it >was ↑JUST< a=pass’. By giving this sentence, Aya shifts the focus of her request by paraphrasing what she wants to say but indicating uncertainty of its ‘correctness’. Again Aya indicates a good deal of English language knowledge, however, as it is embedded in an information request sequence, she cedes epistemic primacy to Bev.

As Aya delivers this sentence, Bev overlaps, but doesn’t take the floor, with ‘[a°h:-°]’ in line 12 before overlapping in line 14 with a declarative TCU ‘[>↑WE] say< ↑WITH a THIRTY SIX’. By giving a continuer in line 7 and not interjecting during any of the pauses in Aya’s ongoing talk, Bev effectively encourages Aya to continue her talk. Bev does this until she seemingly understands the nature of Aya’s information request and asserts ‘thirty six’ in line 14. Consequently, as Bev’s ‘[a°h:-°]’ in line 12 just precedes her declaration of what is ‘correct’ English which brings Aya’s information request to an end, it marks the moment that Bev understands the nature of Aya’s information request. I term this the ‘penny-drop moment’: when the receiver of an information request displays an orientation to realizing what information they should provide in the next turn. This functions to draw the information request to a close and precedes the provision of help.

By giving a declaration in line 14, Bev ratifies Aya’s proffering of her K+ status which gives her the rights and obligations to provide an informing. With the inclusive and emphasized ‘WE’, Bev invokes her membership into a group who speak English competently. As owners of normative language usage, Bev obtains the epistemic rights to arbitrate what is and is not normative language use. Additionally, the ‘>↑WE] say<’, preface to ‘with a thirty six’ shows Bev speaking on behalf of the group. This preface therefore imbues the assertion (‘with a thirty six’) with considerable authority. As the preposition Bev provided (‘↑WITH’) is not one of the three Aya provided (‘↑ON’, ‘↑BY’, ‘↑IN’), Bev implicitly rejects their ‘correctness’ in favour of ‘with’. Nevertheless, by providing an authoritative version of prepositional phrase, Bev provides an aligning and preferred answer. Furthermore, Bev’s forthright delivery of the answer, with no qualifiers or mitigation, shows a rather confident and ‘knowing’ epistemic stance.

In line 17 Aya repeats ‘↑WITH’ thus suggesting an acknowledgement and acceptance of Bev’s version. Bev confirms this with a clear ‘↓ye:ah’ in line 18 before Aya reworks it with ‘↑with a score of thi[rty ↓six]’. By reworking Aya further indicates her acceptance of Bev’s ‘with’ and demonstrates some knowledge of its use. This prompts Bev’s overlapped ‘[i: PA]SSed the score with °uh:° with a ↑thirty ↓six’ in lines 20-21. Here, Bev seemingly attempts to incorporate Aya’s ‘score’ but following the hesitation marker ‘°uh:°’ she repeats her earlier formulation. Despite slight ‘trouble’, by repeating/re-asserting the earlier formulation, Bev re-asserts and again displays an orientation to her relative K+ status. Aya utters ‘↑with (0.3) ↑AH (a)’ in line 22. This partial-repeat of Bev’s preceding turn functions to topicalize the indefinite article ‘↑AH (a)’ and make it the focus of the following talk. In line 23 Bev repeats Aya’s partial-repeat (‘with AH: (a)’) and, following a micro-pause, adds ‘↑thirty ↓si:x’, confirming the ‘correctness’ of ‘AH:’ and again orienting to her own K+ status. Aya’s repeat of ‘AH:’ indicates her digestion of Bev’s confirmation, which functions to ratify Bev’s K+ status and complete this sequence.

Extract 2: Summary

The analysis of Extract 2 shows a complex and extended information request sequence, with its object being a matter of English language grammar. While Aya begins an information request in line 3, the completion of the request becomes a somewhat lengthy process that sees Aya's considerable interactional work and shifts in epistemic positioning. Aya's starting of a "'wh-" type interrogative' begins the invocation of an epistemic status asymmetry which would make relevant Bev's explanation of how to say something, and by giving a CIK she draws attention to a perceived linguistic limitation while delaying the completion of her information request. This CIK also functions as a preface to her candidate version of what she passes over to Bev to (dis)confirm: 'she passed the test on, by, with a thirty six'. Aya then almost immediately paraphrases what she wants to say but is not sure of its 'correctness'. All of this work functions to narrow down the terms of Aya's request and inform Bev as to what help is necessary, prompting Bev's 'penny-drop moment' and subsequent help. By shifting the terms of the request from requiring an explanation about some unknown matter to producing English language formulations and requiring (dis)confirmation of alternative prepositions, Aya undergoes a considerable epistemic hike. She displays good English language knowledge yet orients to her occasional limitations. Consequently, as the talk progresses, it appears to be one capable English language participant requesting the help of an even more knowledgeable participant. The final extract, below, considers another extended sequence undertaken to enable the ALT's help.

Extract 3

Prior to the transcribed talk, Aoi (JTE) and Ben (ALT) are discussing the construction of a speech for their students' upcoming debate contest with the theme of capital punishment. In transcribed talk below Aoi relays to Ben advice she received from Nishimura sensei about the contents of a speech.

- 1 Aoi AH::: hhh told U::s that (.) in if yu- (0.3) if we-
 2 (0.6) if we >talk aboutuh< CAPital punishment: (0.4)
 3 we ↑usually: (0.5) AH::: have TH↑REE: THRee ele↑ments:
 4 Ben Uh:↓m
 5 Aoi and (.) ↑o:ne I::S (0.3) THE::: (0.4) °↑how can I s↓ay°
 6 (1.5)
 7 Aoi ↑HOW CAN I S↓AY
 8 (0.4)
 9 like a revenge (.) reVENGE >to iu ka?<
like revenge or something?
 10 Ben ↑Uh↓m
 11 Aoi if W↑E::: do::: >something< BA:::↓D >we should be<
 12 PUNISHED=
 13 Ben =for THA(.)t
 14 Aoi for [that]
 15 Ben [oh:::] ↑AH:::m=
 16 Aoi =o:r f↑o:r (.) THA:::=
 17 Ben =↑we'd >say< punishment=
 18 Aoi =PUNISHm[ent] punishment .hh and ↑second second=

19 Ben [y_eah]
 20 Aoi =(.) AH:: (.) element i::s (0.3) AH:M

Despite Aoi's talk in lines 1-3 being somewhat marked by pauses, cut-offs and self-repairs, she does relay to Ben some of Nishimura sensei's advice regarding 'THREe elements:' as being necessary for a speech about 'capital punishment'. As the formulation is syntactically and pragmatically seemingly complete for now, Ben, in line 4, responds with the continuer 'Uh:↓m', passing the floor back to Aoi. In line 5 Aoi duly continues to relay the advice by progressing to element one. This turn, however, is delivered rather slowly, with sound stretching and pauses. Furthermore, before pragmatic completion of this segment of advice, Aoi shifts the course of action from relaying Nishimura's advice by uttering '°↑how can I s↓ay°'.

This utterance has the grammatical composition of a 'wh-type interrogative'. However, as this comes before Aoi has provided any further information about 'element one' (other than stating she doesn't know how to say it), and it is delivered somewhat quietly, seemingly not making relevant any 'help' from Ben, this is a 'self-addressed question for recollection', a practice found to be frequently used during word searches (Hayashi, 2003). Aoi appears to be having trouble finding a suitable way of describing 'element one' and a claim to an 'unknowing-at-this-point' epistemic status is quietly given. This marks an important change: Aoi clearly halts the *relaying* of Nishimura's advice and shifts the focus to dealing with her *difficulty in delivering* 'element one'.

Then follows a 1.5 second pause in line 6 in which the floor appears to be open. At this point Ben does not treat Aoi's prior turn as an 'appeal' (Faerch & Kasper 1983), nor does he request Aoi's clarification. Then Aoi re-takes the floor in line 7 with the repeat '↑HOW CAN I S↓AY'. The increased volume sees Aoi upgrade her previous utterance, indicating she is still unable to provide a description of 'element one' and placing her claim of an 'unknowing' epistemic status clearly on record. Following this is a 0.4 second pause and, again, with no request to help given nor any clues as to the nature of what Aoi is seeking to deliver, Ben does not take the floor.

At this point Aoi tries a different tack, uttering 'like a revenge' in line 9. Here Aoi progresses from claiming an unknowing epistemic status to providing a word. While Aoi displays enough English-language knowledge to provide this word, the pre-positioned 'like a' sees her treat 'revenge' as a near but not exact equivalent to the word she is looking for, thus downgrading its epistemic veracity. Following a micro-pause, Aoi utters 'reVENGE >to iu ka?< (like revenge or something?)'. The turn-ending rising intonation of this utterance shows that Aoi is delivering a YNI (Raymond, 2003), making relevant Ben's (dis)confirmation of the 'correctness' of 'revenge'. Aoi repeats the just-delivered English word but this turn, a YNI, imposes more accountability upon Ben. As such, Aoi progresses from displaying an unknowing epistemic *status* to using grammatical and prosodic means to trigger Ben's K+ status and provide help. Additionally, Aoi's use of Japanese at this point indicates her orientation to Ben's own Japanese language knowledge. Here, Aoi treats her access to the English language epistemic domain as good enough to provide a word that may be correct but requires Ben's confirmation. Consequently, while Aoi displays some English-language knowledge, she cedes epistemic primacy to the confirmer Ben. In line 10, Ben utters '↑Uh:↓m' which is followed by further talk from Aoi. Therefore, Ben's turn functions as a 'continuer'. Here, Ben does not treat Aoi's use of Japanese as an accountable matter. Rather, he orients to the necessity of Aoi providing further information.

In lines 11-12 Aoi continues with a shift from requesting Ben's help with a YNI to giving a description of a situation in which the sought after formulation would occur: 'if w↑E::: do::: >something< BA:::↓D >we should be< PUNISHED'. Although the sound-stretches here slow the delivery of the turn and may indicate she is 'doing thinking' as a means of holding the floor,

Aoi's delivery of this compound TCU show a good deal of English language knowledge, a 'knowledgeable' epistemic stance. Ben latches on to Aoi's turn and provides grammatical completion: 'for THA(.)t' in line 13. Here, Ben proposes an understanding of Aoi's description, indicating that intersubjectivity has been achieved. This completion is immediately ratified by Aoi's repeat 'for [that]' in line 14.

Then in line 15, Ben overlaps with '[oh::] ↑AH:::m'. As Aoi begins to deliver some form of alternative formulation, Ben latches with '↑we'd >say< punishment' in line 17. Here, Ben asserts that 'punishment' is the correct word and thus provides the English language help that Aoi requested and ratifies his relative K+ epistemic status. Similar to Bev in Extract 2, when providing help Ben uses the pronoun, and somewhat emphasizes, the pronoun 'we'. Ben invokes his membership of a group with competent speaking abilities, thus giving him the rights to speak on behalf of this group and state what their normative language use is. This preface adds authority to the assertion that 'punishment' is 'correct'. This is a similar practice to that Bev used in Extract 2, line 14. Importantly, Ben's '[oh::] ↑AH:::m' in line 15 marks the moment in which he proposes to have gleaned enough information from Aoi's prior talk to enable his assertion in line 17. As such, this 'penny-drop moment' renders Aoi's information request complete.

In response, Aoi twice repeats Ben's provided item. The latched placement and increased volume of this repeat indicates that this is Aoi's clear and emphatic 'acceptance signal' (Hosoda, 2000), treating 'punishment' as 'correct'. Ben's overlapped 'yeah' in line 19 further indicates their joint orientation to this. Following this Aoi progresses to the 'second element'. This sees Aoi initiate an end to the 'first element' sequence by progressing to the next 'element', thus returning to the earlier business of relaying Nishimura's advice. In this English language help sequence, Aoi displays her identity as a competent and knowledgeable speaker of English who occasionally requires the assistance of an even more knowledgeable participant.

Extract 3: Summary

In sum, in line 5 Aoi breaks off from relaying the advice and draws attention to her own K-epistemic status in some language-related domain, yet doesn't request Ben's help. Aoi moves on to upgrade her exclamation of K- status, placing it more 'on record'. Aoi then provides the English language word 'revenge' which is downgraded to a near equivalent – thus showing English language knowledge with some limitations. Then Aoi repeats the word and switches to Japanese to deliver a YNI, imposing more accountability upon Ben – to (dis)confirm the 'correctness' of 'revenge'. Again, Aoi claims some knowledge of English, enough to provide a 'possibly correct' word, yet by necessitating Ben's help she cedes epistemic primacy to him. This, however, does not generate an assertion and Ben gives a continuer, orienting to the necessity of further information from Aoi. She then gives a description of when the sought after item(s) would be used, with Ben latching to provide its grammatical completion. This again shows Aoi's knowledgeable epistemic stance, and an alignment from Ben. Then after Ben's 'penny-drop moment', he is able to provide the 'correct' word, which is accepted by Aoi who then moves back to relaying Nishimura's advice. As such, enabling Ben's help requires not only the declaration of Aoi's K- status and invocation of an epistemic asymmetry, but also Aoi's tapping into her own access to the English language domain to show herself as a competent user of English who occasionally requires the help of a relatively more knowledgeable participant.

5. Concluding Discussion

This study aimed to further understand the ways in which one language teaching professional uses another language teaching professional (their 'team-teaching' partner) as a resource for their language learning in a staffroom setting. Analysis of this data clearly revealed that these interactions are composed of English language-related information requests from the Japanese teachers, some form of help provided by the non-Japanese teachers, then language learning

sequence closure. Previous studies have examined the relationship between information request and their corresponding answers. Such research has revealed, for example, the ways in which recipients of information requests can break from their restrictions by giving ‘transformative answers’ (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010), can reshape the trajectory of the sequence in the turn-initial space (Kim, 2013), and can give K- status claims following ‘questions’ (Beach & Metzger, 1997; Sert & Walsh, 2013). The current study adds a new dimension of understanding to this growing body of epistemics-in-SLA research by paying particular attention to how information requests emerge and what it takes to enable language-related help to be given.

The most apparent point to make is that these English language-related ‘help’ sequences are extended sequences occurring over numerous turns. However, Extracts 1 and 2 see the requester begin the sequence with the announcement of an epistemic asymmetry (‘[do: ↑you say] (.) q↑uality peo↓ple’ and ‘↑how: can you <sa:↓:y>’ respectively), while the requester in Extract 3 displays an orientation to her own K- status (‘°↑how can I s↓ay°’). As such, the requester in Extracts 1 and 2 place themselves in a relative K- status position and the recipient in a relative K+ position, while the requester in Extract 3 announces her K- status. Concurrent with Heritage’s (2012b) claims, indications of such epistemic asymmetries and epistemic lacks trigger sequences that continue until the achievement of epistemic equilibrium on a particular matter (igniting the ‘epistemic engine’). Apparent in this data is that these early epistemic indications are only the beginning of a fairly lengthy interactional process and actually enabling the recipient’s K+ action of providing the required help takes considerable work.

In Extract 1, while Aya begins with a YNI. Although this informs Bev that Aya is beginning the process of requesting help and thus proffers an epistemic status differential, it alone fails to generate help immediately. This help is enabled after Aya’s extended explanation of what the sought-after word means, an example of when it may be used, then another YNI. Here, the requester utilizes her access to the English language domain, showing herself to be a very knowledgeable user. In Extract 2, Aya’s initial “Wh” type interrogative invokes an epistemic status asymmetry, yet before its completion Aya draws attention to her own K- status in the English language domain with a CIK, which prefaces her following candidate formulation that includes various prepositions that may or may not be ‘correct’. Aya then almost immediately produces a paraphrasing of what she is not sure about, before Ben provides help. Here Aya shifts from requesting an explanation of something to producing her own candidate formulations and paraphrasing that requires confirmation: a considerable display of English language proficiency and a major epistemic leap. In Extract 3 Aoi cuts off one activity and starts the language help sequence by claiming that she does not know the word (K- status), this claim is soon upgraded before Aoi provides a downgraded item (‘revenge’) then directly requests Ben’s help with a YNI. As this does not yield help, Aoi gives a description of when the sought-after item would be used, before Ben provides help.

In each of these extracts the requester places themselves in a K- status position in English language domains. Considering students in group tasks in an L2 classroom, Jakonen and Morton (2013) find that students frequently invite other group members to focus on problematic parts of a particular task. They do this by highlighting the source of the problem and expressing their own K- status. One of the group members, a “possible knower” (p. 6), orients to his/her own K+ status and provides help, which, if then accepted, confirms their K+ status within the group. In the current study, however, to enable an assertion and confirmation of a recipient’s K+ status, the requester is required to go beyond identifying the source of the problem and claiming their own K- status. These extracts show that to enable the enactment of the recipient’s K+ status (by providing help), it is necessary for the relative K- status participant to tap into their access to this epistemic domain so as to adequately inform the prospective ‘helper’ of what form the required help should take. In doing so, the requesters show themselves to have a very good depth of knowledge within the domain in question, displaying considerable English language proficiency. Raymond’s (2003, 2010) findings

on information requesting turns provide vital help in informing the researcher about the social relations embedded in them. However, interestingly, the information requesters in this data use different forms of information requests over the course of the sequences, shifting across an epistemic gradient claiming increasing degrees of knowledge. However, it is clear that despite maneuvering across the epistemic scale, as these are framed within information request sequences, the deliverer still orients to their relative K- status position. As such, enabling a K+ participant's access to the domain in question necessitates the K- status participant's careful exploitation of his/her access to this domain. This shows the requesters' identity as being that of a very capable English language user who occasionally comes upon limitations that can be helped by an even more linguistically knowledgeable participant.

This study also identifies the occurrence of the 'penny-drop moment', marking the spot when the prospective helper displays an orientation to realizing what the request is making relevant for them to do in the next turn. This concludes the information request and precedes the help. Although identified in this study, the 'penny-drop moment' is not necessarily limited to language help request sequences. Indeed, the author expects this is a practice that draws to a close request sequences and precedes provisions of various kinds in a multitude of environments. Further research will shed light on the (likely) breadth and numerous usages of this practice. Finally, to my knowledge, this is the first Conversation Analytic study to consider language learning processes in teacher-teacher interactions, despite the large growth of 'team-teaching' programmes in Asia bringing together English L1 and L2 speaking English teachers. It is hoped this will act as a prompt for further such studies on teacher-teacher interactions.

References

- Beach, W. & Metzger, T. (1997). Claiming insufficient knowledge. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 562-588.
- Brandt, A. (2011). The maintenance of mutual understanding in online second language talk. PhD thesis, Newcastle University, UK. Retrieved from <https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/dspace/bitstream/10443/1213/1/Brandt%2011%28note%20to%20be%20added%20on%20upload%20-%20multimedia...at%20Robinson%20Library%29.pdf>
- Brouwer, C. (2003). Word Searches in NNS–NS Interaction: Opportunities for Language Learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 534-545.
- Butler, C., Potter, J., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Advice-implicative Interrogatives: Building "Client-centered" Support in a Children's Helpline. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(3), 265-287.
- Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of Knowledge in Conversational Interactions. In I. Markova & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in Dialogue*, (pp. 29-48). Hemmel-Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Drew, P. (2012). What drives sequences? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 61-68.
- Ehrlich, S. & Freed, F. (2010). The function of questions in institutional discourse. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *"Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse*, (pp. 3-19). New York, NY: OUP.
- Englert, C. (2010). Questions and responses in Dutch conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2666–2684.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & C. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.
- Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 127-156.

- Gardner, R. (2012). Enriching CA through MCA? Stokoe's MCA keys. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 313-319.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Territories of knowledge in Japanese interaction. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- Hayashi, M. (2003). *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heinemann, T. (2010). Questions in Danish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2703-2725.
- Heinemann, T. & Lindström, A., Steensig, J. (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. 107-131). Cambridge: CUP.
- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2011). Threats: Power, family mealtimes, and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(1), 99-120.
- Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society*, 27(3), 291-334.
- Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(10-11), 1427-1446.
- Heritage, J. (2010). Conversation Analysis: practice and methods. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research*, (pp. 208-230). London: Sage Publications.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1-29.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 30-52.
- Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 15-38.
- Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35(5), 667-705.
- Heritage, J. & Sorjonen, M. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences. And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, 23, 1-29.
- Horii, S. (2012). "Foreign language activities" in Japanese elementary schools: negotiating teacher roles and identities within a new language education policy. Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, <http://purl.umn.edu/144134>.
- Hosoda, Y. and Aline, D. (2012). Doing being interrupted by noise as a resource in second language interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1), 54-70.
- Houtkoop-Stenstra, H. (1994). De interactionele functie van zacht spreken in interviews [The interactional function of low volume in interviews]. *Gramma/TTT*, 3, 183-202.
- Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2013). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics (Advance Access)* doi:10.1093/applin/amt031.
- Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 86-105.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: a description of its interactional functions with a focus on I think*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2007). The role of *I guess* in conversational stancetaking. In: Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, (pp. 183-219). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kim, Y. (2012). Practices for initial recognitional reference and learning opportunities in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 709-729.
- Kim, H. (2013). Reshaping the response space with *kulenikka* in beginning to respond to questions in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 303-317.
- Koshik, I. (2003). Wh-Questions Used as Challenges. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 51-77.
- Koshik, I. (2005). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse studies*, 7(2), 193-211.

- Koshik, I., & Seo, Mi-Suk (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text & Talk*, 32, 167-189.
- Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second Language Interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Markee, N. & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom Talks: An Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491-500.
- McConnell, D. L. (2000). *Importing diversity. Inside Japan's JET program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Mishler, E. G. (1984). *The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of Medical Interviews*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Mondada, L. (2009). Emergent focused interactions in public places: A systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(10), 1977-1997.
- Park, I. (2012). Asking different types of polar questions: The interplay between turn, sequence, and context in writing conferences. *Discourse Studies*, 14(5), 613-633.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). *Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes*. In: J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis*, (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: CUP.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Raymond, G. (2000). The Voice of Authority: The Local Accomplishment of Authoritative Discourse in Live News Broadcasts. *Discourse Studies*, 2(3), 54-79.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes / No interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939-967.
- Raymond, G. (2010). *Grammar and social relations: Alternative forms of yes/no-type initiating actions in health visitor interactions*. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), "Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse, (pp. 87-107). New York: OUP.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4): 289-327.
- Sert, O. (2013). 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1), 13-28.
- Sert, O. & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*. 27(6), 542-565.
- Shannon, C. & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Stivers, T. & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society*, 39, 1-25.
- Stivers, T., Mondada, L. & Steensig, J. (2011). *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Stivers, T. & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(1), 3-31.
- Stokoe, L., Benwell, B., & Attenborough, F. (2013). University students managing engagement, preparation, knowledge and achievement: Interactional evidence from institutional, domestic and virtual settings. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 2(2), 75-90.
- Wang, J. (2006). Questions and the exercise of power. *Discourse and society*, 17(4), 529-548.
- Weatherall, A. (2011). I don't know as a Prepositioned Epistemic Hedge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44(4), 317-337.
- Wilkinson, S. (2011). Constructing ethnicity statistics in talk-in-interaction: Producing the 'White European'. *Discourse Society*, 22(3), 343-361.