

The Teacher Membership in The Supervisor-student Interpersonal Conversation on Cultural Semiotics and Drabble's Study

Wei Wang^{1, a}

¹ Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, China

^a 1534262205@qq.com

Abstract

This study looks at an English as a Lingua Franca interaction but between supervisor and college students at school, exchanging understanding of cultural semiotics. Conversation analysis (CA) is used to examine two short clips from an informal conversation occurred in the school office, discussing winter holiday reading about Drabble. The research purpose is to explore the possible influence of teacher's identity have on the oral communication, and thus better understand how the varying institutional identity could make a difference among the varying speakers. Their ELF interpersonal conversation has been investigated from four dimensions: category-bound questioning, co-producing, repairing and turn controlling. Transcript excerpts indicate that power relation is highly aware by both parties at such workplace on literary interpretation. For one thing, even casual talk for social purposes could be influenced by the institutional membership, for another, such institutional interpersonal conversation usually maintain productive and efficient.

Keywords

Institutional membership, conversation analysis, ELF.

1. Introduction

Chinese are widely known for showing great respect to teachers and the senior group historically, whilst if this feature could also be found among their English as a lingua franca (ELF) interaction requires further exploration (Holmes, 2004). Teacher, often seen as the dominant role in the classroom settings, may be regarded an influential identity in informal conversations as well (Richards, 2006; Seedhouse, 2005). This paper intends to investigate the implication of the teacher's identity on the casual interaction between supervisor and postgraduates in a professional place – school office in an ELF context. The recorded video data would be applied to conversation analytic methodology and discussed about the institutional membership categorization as a teacher during ordinary-oriented talk in workplace in terms of follow-up questioning, collective completion repair and turn-taking.

Generally, conversation analysis (hereafter CA) could be seen a distinctive method of emphasizing the social interaction between speakers not sharing the first language (L1) but choosing English as a common tool for communication (Dewey, 2007; Jenkins, 2014). The overall naturally occurring data could be divided into two categories, namely casual/ordinary talk and institutional talk (Mondada, 2013; Liddicoat, 2007). This paper would mainly focus on the casual conversation occurred in the institutional setting using CA where "the membership categories to which participants belong are interactionally important" (Liddicoat, 2007: 16). Membership categorization could provide a useful perspective for understanding the impact of teacher's identity in their talk with students. More specifically, such communication could be judged for categorized talk in workplace based on three criteria, namely the task-oriented

conversation, the role of speaker reflected in the talk relevant to professional task and the emergence of task-related vocabulary or notions (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

To illustrate the possible effect of teacher's identity have on the oral communication between supervisor and students, a general literature review of research fields such as ELF setting, through CA and membership categorization will be stressed first, then followed by the detailed description and excerpts analysis of the social actions related to identity of teacher, the co-construction of meanings by use of the collective utterance completion and other-initiate repair in the interactional talk. It will conclude by discussing how this membership influences the ongoing conversation by teacher's behaviors and perceived responses from students among such sequences.

2. Literature Review

2.1. English as a lingua franca

Originated from the human history in the late 17th century, the term of 'lingua franca' is known as a bridge language and common tool for intercultural communication (Firth, 2012). It is widely accepted that nowadays the international information and technology exchanges relies heavily on English as a lingua franca owing to the power of English-speaking countries in globalization and its language spread all over the world, in particular in professional settings when a third language is required (Dewey, 2007; Jenkins, 2014).

It has been noticed that the number of non-native users (NNS) of English, or in other words, the second language (L2) speakers have outnumbered the native speakers (NS/L1 speakers) since English plays an inevitable role in intercultural encounters like language classroom, higher education among overseas students, immigrants and global commercial negotiations (Jenkins, 2003; Canagarajah, 2005). Many scholars have focus on the lingua franca study basically in empirical settings such as L1-L2 contexts (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Jenkins, 2012), however, it is increasingly suggested that research on naturally occurring ELF interactions should expand the conversation analysis outside the past contexts since some principles of such contacts may not be suitable for the absolute 'lingua franca' environment where English is the third language (House, 2009). Hence, participants could all be seen as 'others' compare to the L1 speakers 'us' and thus potentially leading to more equal linguistic attitude, more tolerance for error and misunderstanding considering the ownership of the language.

The early study of the ELF context from a conversation analysis perspective can trace back to the publishing of an often overlooked article written by Jordan and Fuller in 1975. Later Firth (1996) establishes some vivid strategies named "letting it pass" and "making it normal" based on interaction recordings deviated from previous cases for example in telephone calls, expanding the ELF into a new research paradigm. The 'lingua franca interactions' notion seems to be created without the 'procedural relevance' and also comparably favors defining itself by the content of language user, making "the 'lingua franca' status 'procedurally relevant' for the production and management of the talk" (Firth, 1996: 241). As a result, it suggests a different research scope from the membership categorization and the identity of actual participants, such as age (e.g. youth and elderly), gender (e. g. male and female), specific relations (e. g. husband and wife, supervisor and student, superior and subordinate) and nationality (e. g. American, Chinese, Danish) (Schegloff, 2007). But the conceptual categorizations can indeed benefit the distinction between cognate concepts, for instance, 'foreigner talk', 'learner interaction', 'intranational lingua franca' and 'international lingua franca' (Bialystok, 1990; Firth, 1996).

2.2. Conversation Analysis in ELF context

An adequate research methodology of handling “foreign language interaction” or “intercultural interaction”, CA emerges since 1964 (Sacks, 1992) as it allows scholars to analyze talk-in-interaction which around the nature and social structure of communicative talk (Schegloff, 2000; Firth & Wagner, 1997). By applying this method, daily occurring ‘ordinary, interactive talks must properly be viewed as a locally and delicately accomplished achievement’, therefore the content of talking even appears ‘normal’ in the continuing turn-takings of participants, could be showed explicitly by the detailed transcripts and the sequential analysis of interactive flow in terms of structure and linguistic features could be explored in deep (Firth, 1996).

Although at the beginning ordinary conversation seems dominant in CA study, when it comes to the late 20th century, CA focus began to shift to new scope: non-conversational interactions, located in a more formal setting: workplace, such as education institutions, hospital or courtrooms (Drew & Heritage, 1992). It is worthy noticing that a remarkable consistent focus of CA could be found on L1 interactions, specifically in English context other than actual intercultural talking (Schegloff, 1991; Firth, 1996, 2012).

Recently, arguments about the relationship between the CA focus on the sequential organization of interaction and the broader demonstration of the characterized speaker doing the encounter concerning their identity and even self-assessment arise more attention. Some commentators state that the continuing stress upon those sequential organization and linguistic details in CA has resulted in an unbalance that other dimensions of member’s actions within the talk and non-verbal behaviors may be ignored and left aside, leading to a growing limitation by narrowing the flexible study focus among numerous social actions (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). But among CA research, more attention have been paid to practical actions within the ELF encounters and those phenomenon have been summarized to certain terms or even strategies for achieving mutual understanding and maintaining the talk to meet their communicative purposes. Several important notions are frequently emphasized, such as ‘making confirmation and clarification requests’, ‘repairing’, ‘repeating’, ‘utterance completion’, ‘continuers or agreement tokens’ and ‘overlapping’ (Konakahara, 2015; Björkman, 2011; Cogo & Dewey, 2012).

According to the fact that L2 speaker has exceed the L1 speaker of English in figure throughout the world, ELF interactions would occur more often and deserve increasing attention in various settings using CA, in particular from the membership perspective (Jenkins, 2003; Canagarajah, 2005; Schegloff, 2007).

2.3. Membership Categorization & Identity

The concept of Membership Categorization is first introduced by Harvey Sacks in the 1960s, followed by his systematically development in the publication of his Lectures on Conversation, and such notion address further development later in various aspects by many researchers such as Schegloff, Heritage and Roth regarding the ‘meaning component’ of social action (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007). Closely related to the development of conversation analysis method applied in real life data also around mid 1960s, Sacks’ work on Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs) provide the linguistic researchers an interesting angle for CA concerning the collection of categories/identity of speakers, rules of application and the given categories themselves, apart from the mainstream CA focus on the sequential organization of utterance instead (Schgloff, 2007). And “the use of category terms for persons is the most substantial and important practice of non-recognitional reference, and the Membership Categorization Devices which Sacks introduced are the basic resource for their description” (Schegloff, 2007: 463).

As mentioned above, both CA and MCA share the origins based on Harvey Sacks publications, his expansion of MCA and continuous studies in the field indicate that these two approaches may not be illustrated separately according to the ELF institutional settings, which enjoyed the

development by researchers concerning the membership categorization analysis (MCA) that CA and MCA could be interactive relevant and helpful instead of 'necessarily' distinct, although the study of categorization in talk and interaction has often been overlooked regardless of contexts in recent years (Herster & Eglin, 1997; Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). But it worth noting that both 'The Baby Cried' and the 'The Search for Help' are papers produced in the 1972, indicating that the MCDs applied could be considered the early theory for the CA interactions and thus suggesting it in lack of recent concern and development (Schegloff, 2007).

Considering the collection of categories of membership in the social actions, it seems that the identity-giving for analysis is not just a simple, single aggregate of membership but should be organized into collections of such terms (Schegloff, 2007). Generally speaking, the 'category label' includes gender, age, nationality, profession, education background, political preference, personal hobbies, etc. And a collection ought to be a set of categories that related and matched each other either with equal positions like Buddhist/Catholic and male/female, or have alternative relations such as professor-student, leader-subordinate and doctor-patient (Schegloff, 2007;). Alternatively, collections like sex and age are cited by Sacks as 'Pn-adequate', referring to the absolute categories in such issues that can be applied to any human with no restriction, regardless of their characteristics and variations (Schegloff, 2007). Besides, both the partitioning constancy and inconstancy features of MCDs may differ in various occasions, depending on the specific setting and phenomenon and "can thereby serve as cover or camouflage identities, activating alternative bodies of common sense knowledge, inference, perception, etc., as relevant to conduct and understanding in the situation, and of the situation" (Schegloff, 2007: 469).

To better understanding the membership categories and its consequential role in the conversations, three major aspects namely interference-richness, protected against induction as exception as well as category-bound activities require further emphasis. Firstly, the membership categories play the role of the common-sense knowledge carried by the labels, with the presumption that certain category-based knowledge, also known as common-sense, are shared by all the social members that involved in the interaction neutrally despite the scientific status or character, possibly followed by modifiers in detail. Then, such general knowledge could be protected against induction by providing individual features, leading to a revised different impression beyond the pre-existing knowledge as an exception. And with the awareness of one's category-based identity, the speaker could perform the category-bound action with the preset common-sense of category membership when involved in particular contexts of category-bound activities, especially in institutional interactions with task orientation (Schegloff, 2007; Stokoe, 2003).

Particularly, individuals may have different actions considering the changing contexts and participants. So the language practices in such ELF interactions at workplace could also vary when facing various purposes of communication and speakers' linguistic, social, economic and educational backgrounds (Konakahara, 2015). In this case, factors such as status of communicative talk, English language proficiency, sociocultural origin and even mood could result in variations in 'lingua franca' conversation analysis (Canagarajah, 2007; Firth, 2009b).

3. Methodology and Data

The methodology used for this study is conversation analysis. The video data excerpts explored in this paper are taken from two sequences of student-supervisor multi-person interaction with three students Anne, Bennie and Deng Lihua respectively but in a whole ELF context, each generally involves two participants in turn-taking. The talk is settled in professor Yang's office containing her and three of her postgraduate students. From linguistic perspective, four speakers are all native speakers of Chinese so that their English talk could be considered in a

lingua franca setting among L2 speakers due to the institutional background. All the participants including both the supervisor and students have built a relationship in the 'comparative literature and western literature' module but they only got little knowledge of each other about personal and daily lives.

In short segments of data, they are having a casual talk after some task-oriented interactions about the study of methods of literary criticism like cultural semiotics and reading of Margret Drabble's works, talking about their winter holidays from January to February in China as they just return from home. In this case, such form of ordinary interactions could help build or maintain a better and closer relationship both between tutor and students and among student group by sharing the emotion and individual information. However, owing to the institutional identity and awareness Yang and also her students often have, the conversations seem to become more professional and turn back to study when talking about the reading issue during the vacation, which could be identified as a shift of topic to institutional setting, reflected by serious topics mentioned, such as names of work, 'English version' and short feedback of reading.

4. Data Analysis

The following analysis would focus on the occurrence of professor identity actions in separate chatting pieces in terms of academic questioning, collective utterance completion, repairing, turn-taking and its impact on the ongoing conversation (Konakahara, 2015; Björkman, 2011). It is worth noting that even applying the sequence and micro analysis to utterances in the transcripts, the concern of this paper would still be put on the membership categorization and its implication. As shown in Picture 1 below, such casual conversation tends to help strengthen the relationship between the supervisor and students, however, owing to the office setting and potential pressure considering the ownership of this workplace, the communication seems to be in a liminal setting since both ordinate and institutional components are included



Picture 1. Deng, Bennie, Anne and Prof. Yang (left to right)

4.1. Institutional question

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, A: Anne)

30 A: yeah it's it iks (.) my (0.4) eh ho the

31 ho:me↓ (.) from very warm so (1.0)

32 eh:m I stayed at home eh (.) watch some

33 TV shows and °read some books°

34 Y: >eh-hen<

35 (0.5)

36 A: °yeah°=

37 Y: =so what ki:nd↑ of books (0.3) have you read↓

38 (0.4)

39 A: a:nd (.) en: (1.0) because th:e the

40 teacher:↑ (.) at school↓ gives us eh: (0.5)

41 eh s[ome homework to] do (0.3) so↓ (.)

42 Y: [°some exercise°]

43 A: eh, it's about (.) Lolita↓

This sequence appears in the middle of the interaction between Yang and Anne where the student first mentions the institutional related 'read some books' at line 33 which triggers professor's concern about her study during the holiday and shift the ongoing talk back to the professional setting (Schegloff, 2007). So Yang as a teacher reveals her membership as a supervisor by asking the details of reading (line 37) and results in reinforcing the 'teacher at school' identity (line 40) and specific name of book 'Lolita' at line 43 (Richards, 2006).

Moreover, the overlapping at line 42 seems to happen at a transition-relevance place (TRP) that is acceptable and fits the turn-taking rules naturally (Cogo & Dewey, 2012; Konakahara, 2015; Schegloff, 2000). This behavior results in no turn-holder shift, hardly influencing the current speaker Anne's flow or impairing the sustaining and interactivity of both participants (Konakahara, 2015). Such kind of overlaps indicates a cooperative purpose in the listenership and participation, functioning as turn-competing overlap after certain pause (line 40). In other words, it may even be considered a collective completion although the two speakers produce the synonyms at the same time.

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, A: Anne)

52 Y: °eh-hen° (0.4)

53 so did you like this novel↑

54 (0.3)

55 A: yeh, yes [i

56 Y: [>du<

57 (0.3)

58 Y: do you feel it very difficult (.) to understand↑

59 (1.2)

60 A: not really

61 Y: not really=

After the narration of Anne's reading situation, there seems to be a space for closure of this part and topic shift whilst Yang continues to produce follow-up questions at line 53 and 58, showing her specific interest in student's feeling and evaluation of the reading experience considering the category-bound activities as a teacher (Schegloff, 2007). And instead of asking question like 'what did you feel about understanding it', Yang performs it in a potentially leading way by indicating if it's 'difficult to understand', which could display her developed habit of taking the controlling role as a teacher in category among classroom settings (Richards, 2006).

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, A: Anne)

82 Y: so >have you finish< the, the paper↑

83 A: yeh yeh yeh, [I] I handed in its, eh last week↓=

84 Y: o[k]

85 Y: =aoh, good↓ ((hand pointing the next student))

Here checking homework as a common behavior for teacher is used (line 82) in the form of question and responded by positive answer, Yang also gives a distinctive quick response or continuer 'oh good' rather than her commonly used 'en-hen', which may be more like a statement or comment (Konakahara, 2015; Björkman, 2011, Bjørge, 2010; Kordon, 2006).

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

75 Y: =ok (0.4) but the, >English version of harry

76 potter is< is simple too (0.6) really you really

77 (0.3)

78 A: just once↓ ((lifting a finger)) (0.4)

79 D: °>well<° (1.5)

80 Y: he he he ((laughter))

81 D: maybe I can buy (.) the English version=

82 Y: =yeh (0.8) so did you (.) have time to read

83 some (.) other books↑

84 (0.3)

85 D: e I read >*suo luo men zhi ge*<, but I just read=

86 Y: =solomon

87 (0.3)

88 D: solomon

89 Y: en-hen

This extract occurs near the end of the interaction with student Deng, just after the repair of the 'English version' for *Harry Potter* series reading. Since Deng just went through the Chinese copy in her first language, Professor Yang here takes even the English learning issue of students as part of her supervisor responsibility and suggests Deng to practice language by reading the English version at line 75 and 76 (Richards, 2006). Although Yang is not the language teacher for them, students take her advice as request with power. So Deng provides a tend-to-agree answer despite her true feeling, regarding the 'well', long silence, repeated hedging 'maybe', 'can' and short pause before the 'English version' which weaken the tone of speaking from line 79 to 81 (Lewin, 2005).

Again, Yang asks about student's other readings since she expected (line 82, 83) that they would follow and Deng perceives it an institutional question and mentions an academic work 'Solomon' but in Chinese pronunciation since she didn't know the English term. Being a young Chinese student, she feels free and natural to show her vocabulary lack in English and nonnative speaker categorical membership to the supervisor even if Yang is neither a native speaker nor

the language teacher, treating Yang still as an expertise for English and welcoming the repairing from her (Richards, 2006).

4.2. Collective completion

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, B: Bennie)

- 01 B: so (.) e:: I think (0.5) the (0.3) whole family
 02 members are very (1.5) en:: (1.1) maybe enjoy
 03 this (0.6) e: (0.4) afternoon
 04 Y: eh-hen=
 05 B: e:: (.) and after the: (0.3) ((cough)) film we
 06 (0.5) go to the restaurant↑ (.) and: (1.7) e::
 07 Y: ^aenjoy^a the food↓
 08 B: en:jo[y the foo]d, yeh
 09 Y: [ehh hh hh]

Talking about Bennie's fine day among winter holiday, she introduces the strengths of the film and goes to the 'restaurant' at line 6 which she could hardly continue. After the long pause with no meaningful utterance, Yang helps to fulfill the sentence by revising and imitating the previous 'enjoy this afternoon' (line 2, 3) and gives a supportive completion 'enjoy the food' in a low volume (Konakahara, 2015; Kaur, 2009). And this co-construction receives a positive treatment as Bennie repeats it together with an agreement token (Kordon, 2006).

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

- 39 D: I think I w, wear it, may:: (.) maybe
 40 very beautiful (0.4) e: but we: go around
 41 (0.3) the shopping (0.5) e: (0.4) go around
 42 the shop[ing]
 43 Y: [>shopping mall↑<]
 44 D: the the shopping mall (0.5) e:: but: (0.3)
 45 can't find the suitable one

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

- 72 D: I I read (.) e: (0.4)
 73 Y: Chinese (.)
 74 D: the Chinese= ((nodding))

Later, similar interactional phenomena occur in these two extracts. From line 41, Deng fails to come out the common phrase 'shopping mall' and starts to self-repeat, Yang as the current recipient of talk and maybe also the teacher, cooperatively reminding the term for Deng while the rest two classmates stay quiet aside (Kordon, 2006; Richards, 2006; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). In the next piece Deng again has no idea of what to follow, taking time to think in mind but cannot have the word 'Chinese' out at line 72, thus Yang helps with the answer. Both

collective completions with professor Yang's help gain a favorable response, in particular the repetition of said phrases at line 44 and 74 respectively.

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

92 D: then I gave up↓

93 ? he he ((laughter))

94 Y: so (0.5) you don't like it↓

95 (0.7)

96 D: e:n, it seems (.) e:

97 Y: >it's boring< too (0.4)

98 D: *dui* (0.4) oh yeh eh hehe

99 ((nodding, laughter together))

At the very end of the supervisor-student conversation, Deng talks about her resisting to read the work Solomon, ending with 'gave up' (line 92) followed by laughter. Then a clear and straight statement (line 94, 97) based on her narration is addressed by Yang instead of the student self due to Yang's self-identification as a friendly teacher in the membership categories, speaking on behalf on students' real opinion and displaying her understanding of them depending on years of teaching experience and rich inference of this institutional context (Kordon, 2006; Schegloff, 2007).

4.3. Repair

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, A: Anne)

23 A: =so (.) eh, >it's very cold< so I stayed

24 at (.) home, my home (.) has (0.7) he

25 he:ate:d: (.) ga (.) gas↓ Trouble-Source (TS)

26 ((palm facing up and flapping)) Repair-Initiation (I)

27 (0.3)

28 A: e[h it's]

29 Y: [°eh-hen°] heated gas↓ Repair operation (R)

30 A: yeah it's it iks (.) my (0.4) eh ho the Conversation

31 ho:me↓ (.) from very warm so (1.0) continues (C)

At line 25, Anne initiates repair in the first syllable of what is projected to be 'gas' as same-turn self-repair within the same construction unit (TCU) which makes sense of her utterance (Fox *et al.*, 2013; Kaur, 2011). But her break of word producing and non-verbal gesture indicate that the whole phrase could also be regarded as an invitation of self-initiated other-repair (line 29) from the category membership of Professor Yang in this transition space at the possible completion of the TCU for word searching and explaining at line 28 (Fox *et al.*, 2013; Richards, 2006; Egbert, 2004). Yang operates the repair by repeating but the intonation suggests that shared understanding has been achieved and the conversation could continue.

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, B: Bennie)

- 92 B: eh: it's ver:y cold outside so I >hide in< my house,
 93 and (0.5) but eh (0.4) but (0.5) some days (.) eh::
 94 I, I think it's very >fine day< so I: took my parents
 95 to the cinema to see (.) en: a very (0.4) ^oenh^o
 96 in (1.0) very interesting film↓ (.) directed by
 97 zhou xingchi (0.6) nam:ed (0.3) little <mermaid↓> TS
 98 A: hehh ehh ((laughter))
 99 Y: little mermaid↑ R
 100 B: mermaid yes, eh: (1.0) en:: zhou xingchi is the C
 101 (0.3) ^oth^o (0.7) e is the very famous director↑ TS
 102 .hh e:: (0.5) in i[n China]
 103 Y: [actor too] R
 104 B: eh ye:s C

Student Bennie speaks the 'little mermaid' slower and louder in this transition space at the possible completion of the TCU (line 97), implying an uncertainty for the phrase translated from Chinese and initiating the other-repair herself (ibid). Treated as a supervisor, Yang takes the stretched speech as the invitation for help so she addresses the 'little mermaid' again at line 99 as the clarification for film name, contributing to the ongoing talk began with another repeating of word (Dippold, 2014).

Soon another other-repair operation occurs at line 103, considering the previous short 'director' label for Zhou Xingchi an 'error' by the professor (Egbert, 2004). Her overlapping at this non-TRP seems to be a 'correction', resulting from the teacher identity and higher power among the talking members (Seedhouse, 2013; Fox *et al.*, 2013; Richards, 2006; Lyster, 1998). However, Bennie treats the 'actor' category irrelevant to Zhou's film, differing from the knowledge of her supervisor Yang and therefore receives a repair as unexpected response. Even with a correcting behavior, she still gives an agreement token 'en yes' (line 104) as the backchannel to Yang, reflecting student's tendency of agreeing with 'teacher' unconsciously (Seedhouse, 2013; Lyster, 1998; Richards, 2006; Holmes, 2004).

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

- 61 Y: then the english version↑ (0.3) harry potter TS
 62 ((hand lifting up to describe the book)) (0.7) I
 63 Y: the english version R
 64 (0.6)
 65 D: english version=
 66 Y: =en-hen ((nodding slightly))
 67 (0.8)
 68 A: ^oying wen ban^o ((translating in Chinese)) R

69 (0.5)

70 D: oh no↓ (0.3) en: C

Professor Yang suggests that Deng could read the English version of *Harry Potter* to improve her language ability whilst 'English version' becomes a trouble source that impairing the continuing of interaction. Due to the comparatively longer pause, Yang operates the other-initiated self-repair by saying 'English version' again at line 63, receiving no meaningful reply but a repetition from Deng after another pause (Dippold, 2014; Fox *et al.*, 2013; Seedhouse, 2013; Egbert, 2004). But Yang takes this repeating as checking so she gives a quick confirmation 'en-hen' and nod, assuming Deng would find out and showing no tend to further explain the meaning of word (Konakahara, 2015; Bjørge, 2010). Interestingly, another other-initiated other-repair occurs at line 68 by classmate Anne whispering in Chinese, dealing with the same but unsolved trouble source and finally lead to the answer from Deng (Egbert, 2004; Fox *et al.*, 2013).

4.4. Turn inviting & taking

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, A: Anne)

- 01 Y: e::h, we >spend a< very lon:g (0.4)
 02 winter's (.) holiday, so (0.4) how is
 03 your: (2.4) holidays↑
 04 (2.1) ((glancing at each other))
 05 A: yeah (0.4) I= ((pointing to self))
 06 Y: =>^oso^o did you stay at< home, or: (0.4)
 07 had some had some tu:r↑ (.) outside↓
 08 (1.0)
 09 A: ((hand pointing to herself))
 10 ehh, I spend (.) >most ((strait))<, most
 11 time (.) at home↓ (.) because (0.7)

Excerpt 1 (Y: Yang, B: Bennie)

- 85 Y: =aoooh, good↓ ((hand pointing the next student))
 86 Y: so how is you↑ (0.7) how a[bout you↓]
 87 B: [eh:]

This extract is just the beginning of the ordinary talk where Professor Yang tries to release the atmosphere and offers a chance for social after their academic discussion. She plays the role of host by giving questions respectively, often accomplishing with gestures (line 2, 3 and 6, 7, see also line 86 above), thus controlling the turn-taking in general (Richards, 2006; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). And she also breaks into the utterance of current speaker by repairing the question, shifting the turn as a result (Lerner, 2002; Konakahara, 2015). But owing to the casual talk impact, the specific recipient is self-selected by students themselves as they wait and 'glance at each other' for a while at line 4 before Anne starts to talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, B: Bennie, D: Deng Lihua)

- 17 Y: good=
 18 D: =^o>wo gai shuo shen me<^o ((whisper in Chinese))
 19 B: yeh (0.7)
 20 Y: so how about deng lihua
 21 (0.5)
 22 D: e:: I just >stay ((inside))< and: I feel very boring↓

In this sequence, Yang refers to the next recipient Deng by mentioning her full name at line 20, explicitly inviting the member and giving the turn like in classroom (Lerner, 2002; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). In contrast, the Chinese whisper indicates that it is a casual talk among classmates and close supervisor in which sounds ineffective to the lading conversation such as self-whispering (line 18) is allowed in this informal context.

Excerpt 2 (Y: Yang, D: Deng Lihua)

- 27 D: one day I called my friend=
 28 Y: =so yo yo your parents will↑ >he< (.) feel
 29 very disappointed e huh huh huh ((laughter))
 30 D: e: my <parents> (0.3) e::: at wo:rk↓
 31 Y: eh-hen=
 32 D: they doesn't have holiday
 33 Y: ^oen^o yes:
 34 D: so ei e:: I call my friend, my best friend (0.5)
 35 e:: (.) and we go to shopping

Another interruptive turn-taking at line 28 occurs intentionally because supervisor Yang interests in the reason for Deng's boring feeling just talked before. This small talk (from line 28 to 33) among the short communication starts with the contiguous other-speaker utterance even before the L2 student's pause in her expressing. And such action resulting in turn-holder shift is treated by Deng, the teacher's student, as acceptable with asked explanation (ibid).

5. Discussion

Teacher as a membership category often receives respect and is considered with higher status when facing student groups, especially reflected among Asian cultural circles (Holmes, 2004; Richards, 2006). Specifically, the professor-student conversation occurring in an institutional setting but with more casual talk content could share both institutional talk patterns like in teacher's classroom and some natural features among daily encounters. As researcher Wells states that teachers would attempt to avoid the effect of their evaluation on students' performance and encouraging self-selection, since "the initial IRF generic structure fades into the background and is replaced temporarily, by a more conversation-like genre" (2000: 401).

To investigate the displayed institutional interest of Professor Yang together with implications of her membership as a teacher, it worth noting that because of years of reinforcing this identity,

she often shift the topic of small talk with leading follow-up questions to academic perspective, such as 'what kind of books have you read', 'do you feel it difficult to understand' and 'have you finish the paper', revealing her teacher category clearly with those jargons, and the interaction seems like informal interview with sequential order and influenced by the question-answer adjacency pair pattern (Mondada, 2013; Jones, 2003). Although not in the real classroom, Professor Yang still treats students in a student position, giving confirmation of phrase 'heated gas' and checking the requested reading in the quick focus-shifts from casual to institutional talk. Therefore, it seems that even without the knowledge teaching purpose, teacher member may still have the habit of performing guiding actions such as asking study-bound questions 'did you like this novel', giving information or evaluation 'good' for knowing the paper is handed and correcting error like 'actor too', taking every possible chance for teaching purpose (Huth, 2011; Richards, 2006). It could be common for member with teacher identity to take the control among student-supervisor talk despite the content or location.

Moreover, collective utterance completion may be seen another pervasive structure in conversations involving teacher role, comparatively demonstrating the functionally contribution as cooperative behaviors for students to maintain the utterance. Such co-construction is produced by the teacher role generally after the pause or self-repetition such as 'go to the restaurant and e' and 'go around the shopping, go around the shopping', reminding the lacking terms for current speaker to make sense of their expression (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Kordon, 2006). In this case, student recipients take Yang's collective completion as a natural behavior of her teacher identity both as an expert with more English language and professional knowledge and as well as a interlocutor of higher status (Huth, 2011; Richards, 2006; Kaur, 2009).

Similar to the academic questioning preference, supervisor member tends to support the student speaker by repairing, in terms of both pronunciation and the content if long pause occurs as trouble sources, namely the name of film 'little mermaid' and 'English version' of book *Harry Potter*. She operates repairs often by short repeating like the 'heated gas' to show her understanding of student, encouraging the current speaker to keep talking (Dippold, 2014; Fox *et al.*, 2013; Kaur, 2011). And the 'English version' could be regarded as a special case since it receives the other-repair twice from different participants in two languages. Since Yang's repair in English is perceived as not understandable, Chinese translation is produced by classmate Anne, supporting the talk maintenance (Fox *et al.*, 2013; Ford, 2013). Such code-switching and peer-support phenomenon are allowed under the liminal context where conversation in the office is not task-oriented with more tolerance for self-selected participation (Konakahara, 2015; Richards, 2006; Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Meanwhile, Yang treats long responses of students with encouragement as she leaves space for word searching, expression managing themselves even with many pauses and self-initiated repairs 'the whole family are very, enjoy this afternoon', instead of taking the floor (Konakahara, 2015; Fox *et al.*, 2013; Richards, 2006; Egbert, 2004).

Overall, equality is believed to be an essential character of interaction access to turns that the floor would remain open to all participants. However, there is highlighted evidence that the teacher is controlling the floor, not only in terms of nominating speakers verbally or nonverbally, but by also implicitly confirming the their right to control the floor according to the membership categorization (Richards, 2006; Lerner, 2002). In this case, encounters happening at school office, though in the casual conversational setting, tend to share a similar question-answer pattern with the classroom institutional interaction between professor and students (Kordon, 2006; Richards, 2006; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Students in the data share similar English ability but their supervisor Yang may has higher English language proficiency but certainly more authority and thus her 'inappropriate' actions like turn-holder shift 'so your

parents will feel very disappointed' or collection 'actor too' (Mortensen & Wagner, 2013; Huth, 2011; Björkman, 2011; Firth, 2009a).

Additionally, non-verbal behaviors like gestures or hand movements enable the display of ongoing talk in CA, for example, having trouble in notion expression. It can be regarded as an important part for analyzing the talk as action and interpreting speakers' knowledge of cultural norms or English level (Gabbott & Hogg, 2000; Seedhouse, 2013).

6. Conclusion

Interactive conversation occurred in such institutional environments may be very interesting for micro-analysis to illustrate the organization of social action. After limited the focus of CA on mundane conversation from 1960s, an increasing number of scholars turn their research focus into more practical and professional variety of social contexts: workplace for further exploration (Mondada, 2013; Drew & Heritage, 1992).

This paper has demonstrated the membership categorization and its implication towards teacher identity based on a supervisor-student casual interaction happening in the institutional setting. Distinctive CA methodology is used at a micro level for analyzing transcripts from two sequences among recording in professor's office. The ELF interpersonal conversation has been investigated in terms of four dimensions in detail: category-bound questioning, co-producing, repairing and turn controlling. The findings of data analysis suggests that ordinary initiated talk at workplace with just relation maintaining and social purposes can be seriously influenced by the institutional membership and identity both from the teacher and students' perspectives, leading to the topic shift to their original academic tasks easily triggered by Yang as the supervisor. Apart from environment limitation, the ELF interaction still agrees with some characters of casual conversation considering the support from peers and the shared personal information.

It is conclusively established that based on conversational interaction of ELF setting as mentioned above, the CA research suggests that the identity of being a teacher would have a comprehensive impact on the ongoing talk, especially on students due to the power relation and widely accepted inference-richness to this membership category. As a result, actions produced by 'teacher' would be favorably accessed and responded by students as the opposite identity group with lower status particularly in Chinese cultural norms. Fortunately, as teacher often reveals a cooperative role not only in classroom context but also during casual conversation with students in the office, the specific identity seems not to affect the success of communication negatively.

Note: The recordings are acknowledged and approved by all the speakers. The transcripts have employed the Jeffersonian transcript conventions and the italics represent Chinese words.

Acknowledgments

This research was financially supported by: (1) Jiangsu Provincial Philosophy and Social Science Foundation of Universities (2021SJA0246); (2) Jiangsu Provincial Social Science Foundation (21HQ039); (3) Starting Research Found from Nanjing Normal University (184080H202A160)

References

- [1] Bjørge, A. K. (2010). Conflict or cooperation: The use of backchannelling in ELF negotiations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(3), 191-203.

- [2] Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 950-964.
- [3] Canagarajah, S. (2005). Dilemmas in planning English/vernacular relations in post-colonial communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 418-447.
- [4] Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923-939.
- [5] Cogo, A. & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-Driven Investigation*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [6] Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalization: an interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 332-354.
- [7] Dippold, D. (2014). "That's Wrong": Repair and Rapport in Culturally Diverse Higher Education Classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 402-416.
- [8] Drew, P. R. & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Egbert, M. (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization-some conversational events that trigger linguistic and regional membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1467-1498.
- [10] Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- [11] Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259.
- [12] Firth, A. (2009a). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 127-156.
- [13] Firth, A. (2009b). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 147-170.
- [14] Firth, A. (2012). Conversation analysis and lingua franca. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [15] Ford, C. E. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Turn Taking. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [16] Fox, B. A. & Benjamin, T. & Mazeland, H. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Repair Organization: Overview. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [17] Gabbott, M., & Hogg, G. (2000). An empirical investigation of the impact of non-verbal communication on service evaluation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(3/4), 384-398.
- [18] Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). Dimensions of Institutional Talk. In: *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*, John Wiley & Sons., 34-50.
- [19] Holmes, P. (2004). Negotiating differences in learning and intercultural communication ethnic Chinese students in a New Zealand university. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67(3), 294-307.
- [20] House, J. (2009). Introduction: The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 141-145.
- [21] Housley, W. & Fitzgerald, R. (2002). The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 59-83.
- [22] Huth, T. (2011). Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse, *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5/5, 297-309.

- [23] Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. Psychology Press.
- [24] Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486-494.
- [25] Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: the politics of academic English language policy*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- [26] Jones, A. (2003). Nurses talking to patients: exploring conversation analysis as a means of researching nurse-patient communication. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 40, 609-618.
- [27] Kaur, J. (2009). *English as a Lingua Franca: Co-Constructing Understanding*. VDM Verlag Dr. Mèuller, Saarbrèucken.
- [28] Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2704-2715.
- [29] Konakahara, M. (2015). An analysis overlapping questions in casual ELF conversation: Cooperative or competitive contribution. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 84, 37-53.
- [30] Kordon, K. (2006). 'You are very good' - establishing rapport in English as a lingua franca: The case of agreement tokens. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 15, 58-82.
- [31] Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In: C. E. Ford & B. A. Fox & S. A. Thompson (Eds.). *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 225-256.
- [32] Lewin, B. A. (2005). Hedging: an exploratory study of authors' and readers' identification of 'toning down' in scientific texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(2), 163-178.
- [33] Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.
- [34] Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- [35] Mondada, L. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Institutional Interaction. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [36] Mortensen, K. & Wagner, J. (2013). Conversation Analysis: Overview. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [37] Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied linguistics*, 27(1), 51-77.
- [38] Sacks, H. (1992). *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation (Vol.1&2.)*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [39] Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(1), 1-63.
- [40] Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462-482.
- [41] Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language teaching*, 38(04), 165-187.
- [42] Seedhouse, P. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Classroom Interaction. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [43] Stokoe, E. H. (2003). Mothers, single women and sluts: Gender, morality and membership categorization in neighbor disputes. *Feminism & Psychology*, 13(3), 317-344.
- [44] Wells, M. I. (2000). Beyond cultural competence: A model for individual and institutional cultural development. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 17(4), 189-199.