

# Collaborative Completions in L2 Adult-Child Interactions

Sina Lee

(Seoul National University)

Lee, Sina. 2006. **Collaborative Completions in L2 Adult-Child Interactions**. *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 5, 90-112. In compound TCUs, collaborative completions occur where participants engage in a joint **social** action to construct a single TCU as a whole. This study is based upon an empirical observation of L2 **adult-child** dyads from a conversation analytic perspective. The features of collaborative completions are categorized largely into five : consolidating the prior talk, co-producing of upshot, coordinating into further talk, displaying a point of convergence, and co-participating in joint action. Along with the data analysis some pedagogical implications are **discussed**. (Seoul National University)

**Keywords:** collaborative completions, **adult-child** interactions, conversation analysis, **co-producing**, **coordinating**, **co-participating**, intersubjectivity, alignment

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The turn-taking organization of talk-in-interaction displays how conversation is constructed through systematic turn-taking management rules between participants. Relevant **turns** are sequentially organized by each speaker as an accomplishment of social actions. These social actions may be realized to manage intersubjectivity or to negotiate alignment.

The **systematicity** of turn-taking management rules regulate a *turn* as being constructed by one speaker with at least a single turn-constructive unit (**henceforth** TCU). The **progressivity** of each TCU components displays an orientation to the completion of a turn. However in compound TCUs, where a TCU is composed of

two parts, the current speaker may furnish an opportunity for a recipient entry, leading the sequence into an intra-turn change of speakers (Lerner 1996). It is the projectable character of the TCU components, reflecting the possible completion point, that allows the next speaker to locate their entry in an on-going turn by the current speaker (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974, Ford & Thompson 1996).

**Collaboratively** constructed sequence of talk-in-interaction is a social action which reveals how the next speaker comprehended the prior speech by performing relevant extension of the on-going talk. The conversation analytic (CA) studies of turn-taking organization (Goodwin 1995, Kim 2003, Lerner 1996, 2002) have focused primarily on the collaborative construction of talk by the speakers sharing the same L1 background. Research have considered mainly As noted by Mackey and Oliver (2002), research that directly addresses children's interaction and their output in L2 is relatively scarce. Therefore, it has been more difficult to investigate collaborative **turn** completion between L2 speakers in a naturally occurring interaction of adult-child discourse.

From a CA perspective on second language conversational interactions, this study attempts to examine the construction of collaborative **turn** completion in an asymmetrical environment of adult-child interactions, especially between Korean EFL learners.

The organization of this study is as follows. Section 2 introduces the previous studies of compound TCUs with both English and Korean data. In the third section the data and methodology of the investigation is introduced. Then, in section 4 the data analysis of the empirical observation is examined provided each with some examples. In the final section a conclusion and some pedagogical implications are provided.

## **2. Review of literature**

### **2.1 Previous studies on interaction in CA**

Compound TCUs are identified as a two-component type of TCU (Lerner 1996). The compound TCU is completed by a preliminary

component and a following final component. For example, in an "if-then" or "when-then" construction the "if" or "when" component is the preliminary component and the sequentially latter, the final component. In order for a compound TCU to be wholly completed the preliminary component and the relevant final component would need to be performed in a sequential order as in excerpt (1).

(1) [Smith : Thanksgiving]

1 Lynn : When you don't get any appreciation back from the teachers,  
2 well it's like forget it.

(Lerner 1996)

In excerpt (1) above, Lynn produces a preliminary component in line 1 and as she reaches the possible completion of the preliminary component brings a rising tone (indicated as a comma) implying that a relevant component will continue. The final component is progressed by the same speaker in line 2 and it is at the completion of the final component that a TCU as a whole has been realized and the speaker marks the completion with a falling intonation (indicated with a period).

The compound TCU is constructed similarly in Korean conversation as well. In excerpt (2), the current speaker produces a "when-then" TCU with a slight delay of the final component of 0.2 seconds.

(2) [After Dinner]

1 J : *kuliko kay -nun (.) apple ha -myen -un (0.2) chak*  
and that child -TOP apple say-COND -TOP right away  
2 *nao -ntay ku-*  
come out-QUOT that  
"And when one says apple to that child, it comes out right  
away, that-"  
3 (0.8)

(Kim 2003)

In line 1, the preliminary component reaches a possible completion at ha **-myen** but is not latched off immediately. After a minimal pause, however, the final component continues to bring the TCU into completion by the current speaker, J. What is notable from the excerpt above is that there seems to exist a juncture between the two components which furnishes an opportunity for recipient to enter and participate in the interaction. When the preliminary component reaches a possible completion a slight pause is allowed before proceeding on to the relevant final component (Lerner 1996). Interestingly, the slight pause that occurs in the juncture between the two components, in this case, is not perceived as a trouble marker but as a natural pause.

The preliminary component completion projects a relevant final component but also furnishes an opportunity for the other speaker to complete the TCU. In the next section, anticipatory completions which are **constructed** by collaborative productions will be examined.

### 2.1.1 Anticipatory completions

**Anticipatory** completion onset frequently locates its position when the current TCU-in-progress reaches a preliminary component completion. Within the projected turn space of the **current** speaker, the next speaker may enter before the completion of a whole TCU (Lerner 19%).

In excerpt (3), R produces frequent **intra-turn** pauses and does not continue immediately with the completion of the TCU. After summoning in line 1, R delays the turn with a slight pause of 0.5 seconds and manages to progress from line 2. The recipient takes this opportunity to enter at the point where the possible TCU-internal completion has arrived, in line 3, and continues to participate in the interaction cooperatively.

(3) [Mother's day]

- 1 R : Well honey,  
(0.5) (( R chews and swallows ))  
2 in dis world, really truly.  
(.)  
3 C : you can't be sure.

(Lerner 2002)

In Korean adult conversations, anticipatory completion is performed in a similar manner of confirmation request which come in a variety of forms. Below in fragment (4) shows two Korean adults engaged in a conversation initiated by S.

(4) [S & M]

- 1 S : *WAN:::cenhi machwum hanbok*  
completely tailor-made Korean traditional clothes  
2 *-ulo ay -tul-i::*  
-INSTR child-PL-NOM  
"With completely tailor-made Korean traditional  
clothes, the children,"  
3 M : *ta ip -kwu o -ass -ta//y?*  
all wear-and come-PST-QUOT:IE  
"all came dressed?"

(Kim 2003)

In line 2, S stretches the final syllable of *-tul-i::* and signals that possible TCU-internal completion is imminent. This is also performed with a slight rise in the tone. M monitoring the prior talk, co-participates in completing the TCU with what M has comprehended so far and proposes a candidate understanding in line 3.

Extending this line of research on collaborative turn constructions, the purpose of this study is to examine the features of L2 adult-child discourse.

## **2.2 Previous studies on adult-child L2 interaction**

Based upon Long's interaction hypothesis (1996) which highlights the importance of conversational interaction to promote interlanguage development, the current study examines the previous studies of second language learning in children's interactions.

In a sociolinguistic perspective, children socialize with another to accomplish a social action constructing their identity and their framework with the world through language (Kyratzis 2004). By taking a finer observation on children's language we may be able to discover their potential for participation frameworks and how they negotiate with others even in their second language.

Children's L2 communicative settings were mainly in ESL, EFL classrooms with the primary focus on the input and feedback of the adult taking the role as a teacher (Oliver and Mackey 2003, Mackey and Oliver 2002).

A comparative study of adult-child conversations of L1 and L2 input in Japanese was conducted by Okuyama (1997) focusing on the speech of the caretaker. Okuyama investigated the speech performance of Japanese adults conversing with both L1 and L2 children. The children in this study were younger children aged between two to four years. The results showed that adults' speech production was fairly recipient-designed. The more younger the child the more frequent use of a particular form, in this case the sentence-final particle *ne*, was employed by the adults with a raise of pitch at terminal points to sustain the conversation flow. This research addressed important issues of conversational interaction between children and adult and pointed out the need for communicative interactions which may promote children language development.

Mackey and Oliver (2002) focused on the L2 developmental outcomes of 22 low ESL proficiency children between 8 and 12 years old. Their experimental study of adult-child L2 interaction showed that interactional feedback, in terms of meaning negotiation and recasts, did facilitate children's L2 development of modified output.

In a following study (2003) they investigated the role of the

interactional context between teacher and child L2 learners in ESL classrooms. Their study of teacher's feedback on children's non-target-like productions showed that children modified their output most often when they received explicit feedback which focused on errors of the language form. This research also displayed a strong tendency of the instructors' use of recasts (reformulations) as in excerpt (5) over negotiation (clarification requests and confirmation checks) and explicit feedback (overt error correction).

(5) [Recast]

Student : Why did you fell down?

Teacher : Why did you fall down?

Student : Fall down, yes.

(Oliver and Mackey 2003)

Instead of explicitly pointing out the non-target-like form of fell down the teacher reformulates the problematic form and induces the learner to notice the where the trouble is occurring. The 72 ESL children in this investigation were at a low level of proficiency which may be hard for them to co-participate with the teacher to construct collaborative TCUs. Although not mentioned, it is assumed that if children had problems such as truncated or incomplete TCUs in their turn, teachers would not complete but rather reformulate or produce new TCUs for the young L2 learners. If this is the case, it may be even more difficult to observe the other case around where children complete the TCU-in-progress speech by the adult.

Extending the line of a discourse-centered approach, this study sets all speakers engaged in a conversational setting, adults and even children, participating in the social world to perform particular social actions and to accomplish certain goals through the use of language. A more thorough examination will be focused on how L2 speakers create alignment and manage intersubjectivity, finishing each other's in-the-progress TCUs especially on L2 adult-child conversations.

In the next section, a brief design of the empirical observation on

the participants and the methodology of this study follow.

### **3. Data and methodology**

#### **3.1 Data**

The data of this study were collected from Korean EFL adult-child dyads of approximately 150 minutes in the participants' second language. The one-to-one L2 conversations were from three older children, all twelve years old, in the sixth grade. The three adults, all in their mid twenties or early thirties, were all advanced English speakers. The adult-child L2 conversations were conducted in a casual, spontaneous conversation, which was distinguished from a classroom-discourse, in the teachers' office hours. It should be noted that the interaction between the adults and children were not for an educational purpose, to push the students for significant L2 output, but a "casual" ordinary discourse with no manipulated conversation topic. All the children had intimate familiarity with the adult speakers and replied before and after the experiment that they did not feel awkward when engaged in an one-to-one conversation with their partners.

#### **3.2 Methodology**

Each dyad was composed of one adult and one child in a L2 conversation setting. To induce a spontaneous naturally occurring conversation, the participants were informed beforehand to select a topic of an 'everyday mundane talk' of their own choice. In an attempt to analyze the study as objectively as possible, the first few minutes of the ice-breaking phase will not be considered in this study. All the conversation was audio-recorded and transcribed in accordance with the Conversation Analysis transcription conventions (see Appendix. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998). In all the excerpts, abbreviations of the participants' names are used.

The main purpose of this research is to observe the natural

interactions between adults and children while conversing in their second language. Conducting the investigation within the framework of Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA), this study attempts to investigate how L2 speakers construct collaborative completions for managing intersubjectivity in a L2 conversational setting among Korean children and adults.

In the next section, the transcribed data will be analyzed provided with examples from the conducted investigation.

#### **4. Data analysis**

The investigation of the adult-child communicative interaction in their second language was focused on turn collaborative completions. From the transcribed data<sup>1)</sup> of 150 minutes, approximately 50 cases of collaborative completions were found and analyzed.

In Table 1, each case of collaborative completion occurrence is displayed. As shown in Table 1, the most frequently occurring collaborative completion in L2 adult-child interaction was in the case of consolidating the prior talk which was near half of the total. The second most occurring case of collaborative completion is displayed when co-producing of upshot where ten cases were found. Next, the third and fourth cases of joint completions of collaborative completions were found when speakers coordinated the current talk further and displayed a point of convergence. Lastly, although the actually occurring cases were minimal, there were three cases of joint action when speakers collaboratively constructed their talk in a word search.

---

1) It should be noted that there were more instances of preliminary components and truncated TCUs which were all left incomplete or completed by the same speaker. The purpose of this research is to investigate joint participations of each speakers in the completion of a single TCU. Those that did not meet the requirements were not included in the study.

Table 1. Frequency Distributions of Collaborative Completions

|                                   | Actual Occurrences | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| consolidating the prior talk      | 22                 | 44%        |
| co-producing of upshot            | 10                 | 20%        |
| coordinating into further talk    | 8                  | 16%        |
| displaying a point of convergence | 7                  | 14%        |
| co-participating in joint action  | 3                  | 6%         |

In the next section, each feature of the collaborative completions in this research will be presented with examples in detail.

#### 4.1 Consolidating the prior talk

Next speakers often collaboratively participate with the TCU-in-progress of the prior talk and enter at a possible completion point of an internal TCU. The collaborative action is performed based upon the presupposition that the next speaker has monitored the prior talk and comprehended fully to organize the upcoming talk. By producing collaborative completions the speaker consolidates the prior talk with the previously provided information.

In fragment (6), MJ who is a sixth grader is engaged in a conversation about amusement parks. They were talking about the amusement rides from their own personal experience.

(6)

- 01 MJ : I love (2) roller coaster? but (3) not (1) play uh the (1.5) mm::  
 02 (2) in high? I don't like-  
 03 K : (pst) oh okay.  
 04 MJ : playing high.  
 05 K : you don't like some ri::des which is ve::ry  
 06 (1)

- 07 MJ : hi::[gh  
 08 K : [high. k<sup>o</sup>(hhh)ay, I got it.

In line 1, MJ expresses her pleasant experiences of amusement park rides (roller coaster). Just as she reaches a possible completion of a TCU, she brings the termination with a raising intonation and employs a contrastive discourse marker but to mark a direct disagreement (Kim 2005) with the prior talk. This leads to predictable interpretations that MJ is partially marking disagreements to amusement park rides. This is confirmed in line 2 where the child attempts to produce her speech directly but is left off with a cut-off just before the possible completion point. The recipient K, interestingly, has comprehended the incomplete TCU and exhibits a change-of-state token (Heritage 1984) oh to show that K has managed to understand what MJ was trying to say despite the not-yet-completed TCU. As MJ provides the final component at line 4, K reformulates the talk to show that K has monitored the talk so far and is able to organize the talk. It is in line 5~7 where the adult Korean K has produced an incomplete TCU, followed by a pause of one minute, that the child manages to confirm the information and completes the talk. It is at the point that the child has begun to complete the terminal item that K manages to enter and confirm the delayed final item at line 8.

Note in this respect that even though in an adult-child interaction it is normally assumed that the adult would be the one who dominates and takes over the talk, in fragment (6) the child is also able to participate as an active agent collaborating in the turn completion even in the second language conversation.

Let's take a look at another example below. In excerpt (7), the Korean child MJ is reporting on a movie which both speakers have seen. The young speaker is describing on the scene of an explosion.

(7)

- 01 MJ : and (1) hi::s bomb, [have (.5) uh:: (2) started to  
 02 B : [mhm,  
 03 (1.5)

04 MJ : uh:: (1) started to uh:: >bee-bee-bee-bee-[bee-bee< sound.  
 05 B : [hhhhhh okay, it  
 → 06 was starting to blow. explode.  
 07 MJ : yes.

As shown above, the collaborative completion is accomplished by the adult in line 6. From the onset of constructing a preliminary component the child speaker MJ builds the TCU with frequent intra-turn pauses and delays the turn by employing fillers (*uh::*). This forecasts the trouble coming ahead which also furnishes the opportunity for the recipient's entry in a TCU-in-progress. After a pause of 1.5 seconds, MJ makes another attempt to bring the TCU in completion by completing the slot with another option of voicing. The adult speaker who has comprehended the prior TCU also displays the ability to predict the projected final component by entering early with laughter, overlapping the final part of the prior speaker's TCU. The adult speaker B not only aids in the word search, but cooperates in the current TCU by reformulating the obtained information and consolidating the TCU with a complete component.

## 4.2 Co-producing of upshot

Speakers can contribute in the joint participation by completing the prior speaker's talk. It is at the juncture of the compound TCU that furnishes the opportunity for the recipient's permissible entry. By proposing a candidate understanding conversation participants can organize a joint action (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987, cited in Kim 2003).

Let us examine excerpt (8). In the conversation below, the Korean child K is telling MJ about her daily schedule of going to several private institutions, including art classes. In K's first pair part questions, MJ provides an immediate second pair part answer from line 2 but as she reaches a possible completion point she does not terminate the TCU but continues on with a connective *but*. However, the syllable stretch and cut-off of *bu::t-* along with the

following two seconds of delay projects a strategy to construct dispreferred sequences (Pomerantz 1984).

(8)

- 01 K : °k(h)ay then, are you good at drawing pictures?  
02 MJ : I like drawing pictures bu::t-  
03 (2)  
→ 04 K : you're not good at?  
05 MJ : hhhhhhhh(.hhh)hhhhhhh

Despite the incomplete construction of a whole TCU in line 2, the dispreferred sequence of sound stretch and long pauses along with the discourse marker *but* projects the final component of the TCU without explicit talk. In line 4, the adult participant K, proposes a candidate understanding of the missing component which K had intended to produce. Notice that a preferred construction of a self-deprecation would be to deny the prior speaker's deprecation (Pomerantz 1984). However not only does the K delay her comment, but also overtly produces an explicit face-threatening utterance. K perceives the situation she is in and carefully formulates the upshot by raising the final termination to conceal the action as a "try-marker" (Sacks and Schegloff 1979 cited in Lerner 1996).

The feature of projectivity in a compound TCU enables the next speaker to make a joint participation during an on-going TCU completion. It is the co-production of an upshot that makes the completion of a compound TCU possible as in excerpt (9) below. The younger speaker MJ has just received a compliment on the beautiful ring she had on her finger. Below is the conversation data of the child MJ while taking one of the rings off her finger.

(9)

- 01 MJ : but I can't thiss.  
02 B : you can't take it out?  
03 MJ : yes(hh)hhh. because [my::: hhhhh(°hhhhh)hhhhh

04 B : [oh that's good.  
 05 MJ : finger(°hh)hhhhh  
 → 06 B : it's too fat?  
 07 MJ : hhhhhhhh become fat. ((smiley voice))

In line 1, MJ is in the process of removing the ring off her finger struggling with difficulty. The child speaker makes intra-turn laughters between speech in line 3 while providing reason of her previously mentioned speech. She naturally invites the recipient's participation to complete the final part of her TCU as she produces sound stretches and laughter to fill her turn space. However, the adult speaker B, in line 4, makes an overlapping compliment of the ring and misses her opportunity to complete the prior TCU. So in the next line, MJ produces a small bit of the upcoming TCU but does not make a complete completion. The child delays the talk with laughters while in the process of taking the ring off which explicitly shows the upcoming talk of the final TCU component. It is at this point in line 6 where the adult speaker finally takes this opportunity to co-produce the final component of the TCU-in-progress and brings the TCU into completion. After the few turn exchanges which brought the TCU into completion the child speaker laughs and confirms once again with the interlocutor of the collaborative completion.

### 4.3 Coordinating into further talk

Speakers may extend and elaborate their conversation discourse by using cohesive devices coordinating the following talk with the prior. These cohesive devices which tie the sequential elements together occur in the possible completion point of the internal-TCU leaving space for speaker entry in collaborative completion.

There were 8 cases (16%) of collaborative completions in this study. Consider excerpt (10) below. The adult speaker K is in a conversation, telling her younger participant JA about her favorite Korean food that she has tried.

(10)

- 01 Kim : and your mother, bought some kimbob.  
02 JA : mm::  
03 Kim : which was very delicious.  
04 JA : mm  
05 Kim : and watermelon. (2) it was very good.  
06 JA : yes  
07 Kim : so. my favorite food is, kimbob. (1) I love kimbob.  
08 JA : mm  
09 Kim : good? =  
10 JA : = and?  
→ 11 Kim : and? (3) cmm° I like kalbee too.

From lines 1~7 Kim lists a few items which she favored. In the in-between turns JA produces continuers passing her turn and lets her partner to further her talk. Accepting only continuers for three turns it is in line 7 where Kim projects her turn exits with so to mark her turn in reaching a terminal point. This is repeated with another TCU including the final item kimbob in line 7. The closing remarks of good in line 9 implicits if the provided information is sufficient enough. However JA immediately adds a connector and to elicit further talk from her recipient in line 10. This connector was found unexpected where Kim raises the tone and after delaying her turn for three seconds she additionally provides an incremental TCU and collaborates with the prior talk by completing its missing slot.

Lerner (2004) points out that those single units (*and*) such as in line 10 should not be interpreted as an inadequate contribution but rather a 'recognizable action implemented through a syntactically incomplete format' (p.174).

This was another case where it was not the adult who controlled the on-going talk, but surprisingly the younger L2 speaker who managed to control her turns by employing continuers and cohesive

devices to elicit her recipient in further talk.

#### 4.4 Displaying a point of convergence

In conversation, speakers reach a point of convergence where mutual understanding has occurred and the turn-taking organization allows speakers to perform collaborative TCUs, allocating opportunities to finish the incomplete TCU.

One of the ways nonnative speakers exhibited mutual understanding and managed alignment was through collaborative completions. Conversation participants may reach a point of convergence and exhibit their congruent understanding of the prior talk by completing the missing slot of an incomplete TCU. When speakers are expected to share commonsense knowledge or a particular information, it would be economically more convenient to make an ellipsis and skip over those parts.

This can be seen in excerpt (11). M is a sixth grader who lived near the province with her interlocutor, B but has moved recently to another city.

- (11)
- |      |   |   |                                |
|------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 01   | B | : | how long does it take then.    |
| 02   | M | : | mm:: about for(h)ty or thirty. |
| → 03 | B | : | minutes,                       |
| 04   | M | : | yes.                           |
| 05   | B | : | °ah::° it's too long.          |

As B asks the temporal duration of the distance from M's new town to her old school M gives a moment of thought and provides a numeral answer without a concrete unit. Using commonsense knowledge the recipient provides an incremental single-word TCU to receive a confirming response. Note that in line 3, the adult speaker is not raising the terminal point which would then be an interrogative question displaying an uncertain status. As M presents the anticipated confirmative response it is at this point, in line 5,

that B gives a slight change-of-state token ° ㄴ::° and adds her comment to the previous talk in line 2.

#### 4.5 Co-participating in joint action

One of the environments where co-participation is observed is in cases where the current speaker forecasts possible trouble ahead and seeks for aid in completion. In this case, the next speaker may accept the invitation, or self-invite and perform mutual construction of the TCU-in-progress.

In excerpt (12), the sixth grader Korean child M who has recently moved to another town has told the adult interlocutor that she still goes to school and private institutions in her former town by bus.

(12)

- 01 B : why don't you tak-take the subway.  
02 M : subway? (1) it's too far.  
➔ 03 B : far from what. your house?  
04 M : no. (1) to:: (3) to school and here.  
05 B : °mm::° it's better to take the bus then righ(h)t?  
06 M : yes.

In line 1, B proposes another candidate of quick transportation (the subway) which is assumed to be a much more faster transportation. However, M takes this candidate as an unexpected idea and declines the suggestion indirectly neglecting it by emphasizing the lengthy distance (it's too far) in line 2. The distal information in line 2 has evoked communication breakdowns in induced the adult speaker to produce clarification requests. What is notable in line 3 is that clarification requests are performed by making contributions associated with the prior talk. The adult speaker B, launches a word search for the prior TCU to continue the talk and complete the TCU with more sufficient information. The nonnative adult also produces a candidate (your house?)

assertively with a raising intonation at the final position. Despite this assertively suggested candidate, in line 4, the candidate has been rejected which leads the younger speaker to make a repair of the understanding. As the adult speaker B, perceive the misunderstanding taken place she shows her acknowledgement (° m:° and progresses towards alignment with the child speaker.

So far we in this section the empirical observation on the L2 discourse **between** adults and children have been presented with five features of collaborative completions. In the final section, a brief summary of the data analysis will be presented with some concluding remarks for pedagogical implications.

## **5. Conclusion and pedagogical implications**

The fundamental model of turn-taking organization presented by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) have noted about turn-taking in which speakers talk one at a time with minimal overlaps and gaps as possible. However, in naturally occurring conversations not only overlaps and long gaps between turns but also those cases where conversation participants collaboratively complete a turn to construct a TCU were observed. This joint participation has been accounted for within the framework based on the feature of *projectability*.

In compound TCUs, which are composed of two components, current speakers are entitled to complete the on-going TCU until they reach the possible completion point after the final component. However, there are cases where the final component is carried on by another speaker. The joint construction of the next speaker is not observed as an interruption but rather a collaborative participation that manages intersubjectivity and alignment with the current speaker.

This study investigated **turn** collaborative completions between adult-child interactions in their second language. Three Korean children who were all sixth graders participated in an one-to-one English conversation with Korean adults. The transcribed adult-child dyads were a total of 150 minutes. There were fifty cases of

collaborative completions in this study with the most frequent case (40%) used when consolidating the prior talk. Next, Korean speakers co-produced upshot in a joint participation with their interlocutors. Collaborative completions also occurred when speakers coordinated their talk further, displayed a point of convergence and when they came to a point of convergence.

The features of collaborative completions are briefly summarized as follows: When current speakers reached a possible completion point of the on-going TCU next speakers may enter and provide once again of the previous information, consolidating the prior talk. This feature was displayed through a form of reformulation and paraphrasing. When compound TCUS include some discourse marker such as *but* interlocutors may project the upcoming talk based on what they have monitored and comprehended so far. To elaborate the talk further, extensions were possible through the cohesive devices such as *and*. Employing these connectors extended the TCU further simultaneously tying the upcoming talk with the prior talk. Another case of collaborative completions were shown to display a point of convergence. When speakers shared commonsense knowledge or a particular background information unnecessary information are usually elicited. But these elicited slots may be filled in the slot to display congruent understanding. The final feature of collaborative completions were displayed when speakers displayed joint action. This research introduced the case of a joint action in which speakers were engaged in a word searching activity and how they managed to construct their turns in actual conversations.

In an asymmetrical relationship, such as an adult-child interaction, one with more power would exhibit authority and dominance over the other by controlling the talk. This is the case for Korea, where in a communicative environment children are educated to be great listeners, to be less active and to reduce participation. In these cases where children were assumed not to be active agents when engaged in a conversation with adults, we can imagine how difficult it would be if children were set in a conversational interaction with an adult in their second language. The results of this research demonstrated that surprisingly children were not mere *listeners* but active participants just as adults, competent in

constructing collaborative completions.

The findings of this study bring us to a stage to take further considerations on the pedagogical implications of second language education in Korea. The features of collaborative completions demonstrated that when children could manage social-interactive achievements in their L2 by progressing the **turn** towards completion. By employing devices such as sound stretch, cut-offs, connective markers or leaving the TCU incomplete speakers may invite the recipient's participation and engage in joint action managing **intersubjectivity**. If second language education of conversational expressions were not only from literal expressions but were from actual transcribed data, it may raise the awareness of L2 conversation skills and bring more effective output.

## References

- Ford, C. and S. Thompson. 1990. Interactional units in conversation : syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of **turns**. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar*. 134-184. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. 1995. Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(3), 233-260.
- Heritage, J. 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. *Structures of Social Action*, eds., Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage. 299-345. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA : Polity Press.
- Kim, K. H. 2003. An analysis of collaborative completion in Korean conversation. *Language Research* 39(1), 147-182.
- Kim, S. 2005. English non-native speakers' use of but in conversation. *SNU Working Papers in English Linguistics and Language* 4. 1-21.
- Kyratzis, A. 2004. Talk and interaction among children and co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. In *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33. 625-649.
- Lerner, G. H. 1996. On the semi-permeable character of grammatical units in conversation : conditional entry into the **turn** space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Interaction and Grammar*. 238-276. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. 2002. Turn-sharing : the choral co-production of talk in interaction. In C. Ford, B. Fox & S. Thompson, eds., *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. 225-256. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. 2004. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction : grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(2), 151-184.
- Long, M. H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In : Ritchie, C., Bhatia, T. K. eds., *Handbook of Language Acquisition* 2. Second Language Acquisition. Academic Press, New York, 413-468.
- Mackey, A. and R. Oliver. 2002. Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System* 30, 459-477.
- Oliver, R. and A. Mackey. 2003. Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal* 87(4), 519-533.
- Okuyama, Y. 1997. Discourse analysis of adult-child conversations : the comparison of L1 and L2 input in Japanese. In *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT* 4, 3-19.
- Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds., *Structures of Social Action*: 57-101. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the

organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.

Sina Lee  
sina1@snu.ac.kr