Negotiating Semiodiversity in English as a Lingua Franca in Japan

George O'NEAL

Abstract

This is a conversation analytic study of the emergence of semiodiversity in vocabulary during English as a Lingua Franca interactions in Japan (Schegloff 2007; Seidlhofer 2011). Halliday (2007) makes a critical distinction between glossodiversity and semiodiversity in the development of varieties of English: glossodiversity refers to the emergence of new forms and functions in the vocabulary of varieties of English; semiodiversity, on the other hand, refers to the assignment of novel semantics to words that once expressed different meanings. Using sequential analysis, this study examines instances in which English as a Lingua Franca speakers negotiated the semiodiversity of a lexical item within a repair sequence. This study determines that negotiating semiodiversity in an interaction is an effective repair strategy for successful communication in English as a Lingua Franca.

Keywords: English as a Lingua Franca, Semiodiversity, Glossodiversity, Repair, Negotiated Semantics, Negotiated Morphology

1　Introduction

English as a Lingua Franca (hereafter, ELF) is defined as the usage of English among people of different first language backgrounds from whom English is the communicative medium of choice (Seidlhofer 2011). ELF is numerically the most often used type of English in the contemporary world (Jenkins 2000, 2002; Seidlhofer 2011). However, to say that ELF is a type of English is not to say that ELF is a variety of English, and this distinction is significant for the purposes of this study. Far from being a variety of English replete with standardized and accepted forms, codified usages, and invariant patterns, ELF is defined by the vicissitudes and vagaries of the interaction (Mortensen 2013; Matsumoto 2011; O'Neal in press). ELF is not a term that applies to the regularities of the phonology, morphology and syntax of this type of English; indeed, ELF does not

even assume stability in linguistic forms and functions. Rather, ELF is a description of the ways in which English speakers modify phonology, morphology and syntax in order to successfully communicate. In a word, the focus of ELF research is the ad hoc nature of intercultural communication, not on the shared assumptions (Seidlhofer 2011, Matsumoto 2011; McBride 2014).

One facet of language that can be subject to the ad hoc nature of intercultural communication is semantics. In fact, this study investigates the negotiation of lexical semantics as a repair strategy to restore intelligibility in ELF in Japan, and claims that one way in which ELF speakers can overcome a miscommunication and restore intelligibility is to negotiate the semantics of a word that has been subjected to repair. In other words, one way to overcome a miscommunication is to assign a new meaning to problematic vocabulary. This study investigates this phenomenon, and asks the following questions: Do ELF speakers orient to the modification of semantics as intelligibility attenuating or strengthening? Can ELF speakers overcome a miscommunication catalyzed by an orientation to pronunciation as unintelligible through the modification of lexical semantics?

2 Previous Research

This section will introduce the notion of "negotiated semantics," the process known as "repair" that makes it possible, and will end with a distinction between two possible types of semantic change: "glossodiversity" and "semiodiversity."

2.1 Negotiated Semantics

The notion that the combination of a semantic idea with the linguistic form through which it is expressed, whether orthographic or phonetic form, is arbitrary harkens back to the very foundation of modern linguistics and semiotics (Saussure 1974; Culler 1987). This is uncontroversial. As Saussure (1974) pointed out at the genesis of modern linguistics, the link between the name of an object and the object itself is often completely arbitrary (Culler 1987). That is, the pairings of names for concepts to the actual concepts are often very capricious. After all, there is nothing about the segmental phonemes or orthographic symbols used to express the name of the concept "dog" that is inherently related to canine species. The relationship between the segmental phonemes or orthographic symbols used to express the names of concepts and the concepts is nearly always random.

However, although the community of professional linguists has accepted the idea that the link between names and objects is largely arbitrary, the idea that speakers of languages can freely assign a novel name to an object, or assign a novel object to an old name, is not. That is, most linguists would not support the idea that speakers of languages, especially speakers of second languages, can use novel names at will to express semantics that already have names assigned to them, nor would they support the idea that speakers of languages can use novel semantics to express names that express other semantics. But this is exactly what this study proposes: ELF speakers can negotiate the name assigned to an object and the object assigned to a name; ELF speakers can negotiate the semantics of an object to a name and can negotiate the semantics of a name to an object. However, these negotiations are not accidents; they are means through which ELF speakers overcome—or repair—miscommunications.

2.2 Repair

Repair is a term borrowed from Conversation Analysis (hereafter, CA). Repair refers to a set of practices through which conversation participants interrupt the ongoing course of action to attend to possible trouble sources in the speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk before restarting the ongoing course of action (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977; Schegloff 2000, 2007; Kitzinger 2012). Trouble sources can be nearly anything, including malapropisms, tip of the tongue states, the failure to be heard in a loud room, and other social and psychological linguistic infelicities. This study only focuses on one type of trouble source, however. This study is only concerned with pronunciations that are oriented to as a trouble source and subject to repair.

Once the trouble source has been dealt with, it is often the case that conversation participants proceed to complete the ongoing course of action that was interrupted by the repair. But one thing is important to point out: repair is not the same as correction (Schegloff 2000, 2007). This is a very important distinction to emphasize. Anything that resolves the problem catalyzed by the trouble source also completes the repair. Although a correction can resolve a problem and complete a repair sequence, as we will see in the examples below, corrections are not required to complete a repair sequence.

2.3 Glossodiversity & Semiodiversity

Halliday (2007) makes a distinction between Glossodiversity and Semiodiversity in the evolution of morphology in World Englishes. Glossodiversity refers to the diachronic creation of new linguistic forms as a language system approaches stability and achieves the status as a language variety (Halliday 2007). In Glossodiversity, an entirely new name

is devised to refer to an object. For example, "upgradation" can refer to an upgrading of status in Indian English. Although the etymology of "upgradation" is obvious, this is an entirely new English word, and this entirely novel word is an example of Glossodiversity.

Semiodiversity, on the other hand, refers to the reworking of the previous relationship between names and objects (Halliday 2007). Semiodiversity does not refer to new names, but rather to using old names in new ways to refer to objects. For example, "dog-catcher" could be used to refer to an entirely different concept, such as "a video gamer programmer who makes boring games." Because the original semantics and the new semantics are different, but the name is the same, this is an example of Semiodiversity.

Unfortunately, Semiodiversity is not well studied, and this is largely because of the outdated influence of one man: Noam Chomsky. In 1957, Chomsky introduced the world of language scholarship to the notion of a homogenous linguistic community (Chomsky 1975). Within these hypothesized linguistic communities, Semiodiversity is non-existent because it is unneeded. Homogeneity and Semiodiversity cannot co-exist in a homogenous linguistic community. The idea that homogenous linguistic communities are delineable units is still very prevalent, and still often uncritically accepted even beyond generative linguistics (Trudgill 2001).

However, recent research has demonstrated that all linguistic communities contain variation, and that no linguistic community is completely homogenous (Mufwene 2008; Canagarajah 2013). Chomsky's idea of a homogenous linguistic community is an abstraction, indeed a fiction. In fact, Canagarajah (2007, 2013) goes as far as to claim that all languages are creole languages to some extent because no language community is completely homogenous. Canagarajah's (2013) conception of heterogeneous linguistic community is the antithesis of Chomsky's (1975) conception of homogenous linguistic community.

In heterogeneous linguistic communities, Semiodiversity would be the norm, not the exception. ELF research celebrates the interaction between heterogeneous linguistic communities as the norm of English usage; ELF does not take a homogenous linguistic community as its starting point. Indeed, as Crystal (2003) rightly point out, most English use is between heterogeneous linguistic communities, so arguments that homogenous linguistic communities should provide the norm of language use ring hallow. As English develops into Global English, a moniker which need not imply variety status, Semiodiverse English, will hopefully become more prevalent and more worthy of

research. This study is one aspect of that early endeavor, and one push in that direction.

3 Methodology

This study uses the transcription system of Conversation Analysis (hereafter, CA) to transcribe the ELF interactions. Words that are oriented to as unintelligible and subject to repair are transcribed in broad transcription according to the standards of the International Phonetic Alphabet (hereafter, IPA). However, because both CA and IPA transcription uses brackets but for different purposes, some modifications to the transcription systems used in this study are in order. Braces will be used to transcribe simultaneous utterances (e.g., { }). Brackets will be used for phonetic notation in the IPA (e.g., [ ]).

　　The extracts subject to analysis in the next section are drawn from a large corpus of ELF miscommunications, in which miscommunication is defined as a repair sequence. The ELF miscommunications are taken from conversation homework assignments from intermediate and advanced communication courses at a large public university in Japan. Although most students were Japanese university students, many foreign exchange students also attended the class. The conversation homework assignments were mandatory, and the students often did not choose their own conversation partners. Furthermore, conversation topics were assigned beforehand, but students did stray from the mandated topic in many cases so many natural exchanges appear in the corpus.

　　All of the names that appear in the extracts are pseudonyms that are representative of the first language culture of the speaker: Japanese ELF speakers are assigned Japanese pseudonyms; Chinese ELF speakers are assigned Chinese pseudonyms, etc. All the recordings are audio only, but many students did meet face-to-face or use video channels during Skype interactions, which means that many dyads had access to visual information that is neither detectable nor analyzable in the audio recordings. It is assumed that the visual aspects of the interaction did not have an effect on the intelligibility of the pronunciation in the interactions, but it is possible that the visual element may have had some effect on the praxis of interaction. If it had, this analysis will not detect it. Last, although the nationality, biological gender, and academic major of each speaker are specified in the introduction to each example, this is not a tacit claim that any speaker oriented to nationality, biological gender, or academic specialty as a relevant feature of the interaction. Indeed, in all the cases below, it is difficult to claim that any ELF speaker oriented to nationality, biological gender, or academic specialty in

any significant way.

4　Data & Results

Next, we examine four examples of the negotiation of lexical semantics in English as a Lingua Franca interactions in Japan. In each example, the dyad will negotiate the meaning of a problematic word and subject it to repair. In the process of completing the repair sequence, the dyad will connect a novel meaning to the problematic word that has been subject to repair.

　　The first example of negotiated semantics does not include any Japanese ELF speakers. In the first example, Zhang, a female Chinese graduate student who majors in education, and Suri, a female Thai graduate student who majors in engineering, are discussing their academic specialties, which leads to the following exchange.

Example 1:

1	Suri:	oh. wha kine of your:::: (0.2) study in niigata university?
2		(0.3)
3	Zhang:	thirty?
4	Suri:	study uhm::.
5	Zhang:	study?
6	Suri:	japanese {language?}
7	Zhang:	{ah:　:　:}
8		(1.1)
9	Suri:	{uh:.}
10	Zhang:	{hm:} <I think there is uh:: holiday>, (0.2) in march.
11		(2.1)
12	Suri:	oh. oh. I see. no no no. {>I mean<} uh: what kind of your study:?
13	Zhang:	{hm:　:　}
14	Suri:	{in niigata university}
15	Zhang:	{ah. <my major>?　}
16	Suri:	yes. {your major.}
17	Zhang:	{my major } is:: >education<.
18	Suri:	education? {oh my god }
19	Zhang:	{yeah:　:　:}
20	Suri:	japanese language?
21	Zhang:	no: no no no. its aboute:: the (0.4) the carrier.

22　　　　Suri:　　uh hn.

23　　　　Zhang:　　uhm. the carrier education.

In line 1, Suri asks a question, but a short silence in line 2 presages interactional trouble. In line 3, Zhang proffers "thirty" as a lexical candidate repair for "study," but in line 4, Suri rejects the lexical candidate repair and insists on "study" as the intended semantics. This demonstrates that intelligibility had faltered between the two ELF speakers. In line 5, Zhang attempts to confirm "study" as the intended semantics of the word being repaired, but in line 6, Suri proffers her own lexical candidate repair: "Japanese language." In line 7, Zhang deploys the discourse marker "ah," which makes a claim of sudden realization, and then proffers an answer to the question that she has oriented to: "there is a holiday in march." In other words, Zhang orients to Suri's question in line 1 as if Suri had asked the question "when is there a holiday?"

However, Suri did not ask about holidays in March. Zhang's subjective understanding of Suri's question is wrong. We know this because Suri rejects Zhang's answer in line 12, and then repeats her question in lines 12～14. In line 15, Zhang proffers another lexical candidate repair for "study," this time offering "my major" as the intended semantics of "study." In line 16, Suri affirms the semantic candidate repair of "my major." In line 17, Zhang finally produces an answer that Suri accepts in line 18, which demonstrates both that intelligibility has been restored and that the question-answer sequence that was launched in line 1 has finally been brought to a successful conclusion.

This example shows that semantics are an interactive phenomenon. Far from being determined a priori, semantics are a negotiable event in language use. Suri and Zhang repaired the semantics expressed by the name "study" into the semantics expressed by the name "major." This manifests that semantics are an interactionally negotiable phenomenon, and that the negotiation of semantics is a legitimate repair strategy in the sense that the negotiation of lexical semantics restores mutual intelligibility.

The next example further demonstrates the pliable nature of lexical semantics in ELF interactions in Japan. In the second example, Mako, a female Japanese university student who majors in linguistics, and Zhang, a female Chinese exchange student who majors in education, are discussing the subjective differences between the people who live in Osaka city and the people who live in Niigata city. The common understanding among Japanese people is that there are significant cultural differences between Japanese people from Osaka city and Niigata city, and the discussion of such differences

leads to the following exchange.

Example 2:

1   Mako: ah so I want to ask you about the how do you how di jew feel the

2   Zhang: {uh hm:::::}

3   Mako: {difference} between Osaka and Niigata?

4   Zhang: ohw::: in Osaka people is very:: [ɔt.goʊŋ].

5   (0.5)

6   Mako: pardon?

7   Zhang: [ɔt.goʊŋ] hm.

8   Mako: [ɔt.goʊŋ]

9   Zhang: [ɒt.goʊŋ] hm:: theyre very::: eh.

10   (0.3)

11   Mako: {quickly}

12   Zhang: {(   )} and how to say it=

13   Mako: =hahaha

14   Zhang: [ɔt.goʊŋ]

15   Mako: [ɑʊt.goʊŋ] ah:::

16   Zhang: {hm::}

17   Mako: {uh:::} its like acti- active.

18   Zhang: active active=

19   Mako: =uh hn.

20   Zhang: uh hm its very active.

     In lines 1〜3, Mako formulates a question, which Zhang attempts to answer in line 4. However, the silence in line 5 presages interactional trouble, and in line 6, Mako deploys the open-class repair initiator "pardon?", which nominally claims that Mako does not understand the entire previous utterance (Schegloff 2000). This manifests that intelligibility has faltered; these ELF speakers have ceased to understand each other. Yet, in a twist, Zhang does not orient to Mako's open-class repair initiator as an indication that Mako does not understand the whole utterance. Indeed, Zhang supposes that Mako only misunderstands [ɔt.goʊŋ], which is manifest in the fact that Zhang only repeats [ɔt.goʊŋ] once in her attempt at self-repair. However, this attempt at repair fails, and Mako and Zhang collaborate to arrive at the meaning of [ɔt.goʊŋ]. In line 15, Mako segmentally other-repairs [ɔt.goʊŋ], changing the phonemes in the first syllable of [ɔt.goʊŋ] to [ɑʊt.goʊŋ], and then deploys the discourse marker "ah," which makes a claim

that Mako has transitioned from a state of not-knowing to a state of knowing. In other words, Mako claims she might understand to what [ɔt.goʊŋ] refers. However, Mako does a confirmation check in line 17, which Zhang affirms in line 18. Accordingly, Mako and Zhang arrive at "active" as the mutually agreed-upon semantics of [ɔt.goʊŋ].

This example further demonstrates that semantics are a negotiable phenomenon. Mako and Zhang initiate a repair sequence to formulate the meaning of [ɔt.goʊŋ], and they finally arrive at the shared understanding of [ɔt.goʊŋ] as "active." Far from being taken for granted, semantics are malleable and interactionally determined. These two ELF speakers assigned a new meaning to a word that was not serving its interactional purpose.

The penultimate example further demonstrates a phenomenon similar to the previous two examples: lexical semantics can be a negotiated phenomenon. In example 3, Yan, a female Chinese exchange student who majors in Japanese, and Yuko, a female Japanese university student, discuss Yan's subjective impression of young university-aged Japanese women's sartorial styles and physiques, which leads to the following exchange.

Example 3:

1	Yan:	ande hn ande: girls. girls are always [sɪn].
2	Yuko:	[sɪn]?
3	Yan:	[sɪn]. uhn hn [sɪn].
4	Yuko:	ah [θɪn]. smart. you mean smart? slender?
5	Yan:	no:::
6	Yuko:	ah! fat.
7	Yan:	eh not fat. (0.3) very. s- st- style. style.
8	Yuko:	ah:: style is good?
9	Yan:	hm. style is good.
10	Yuko:	oh really?
11	Yan:	hm. girls are always:=
12	Yuko:	=>I don think so<.
13	Yan:	[sɪn]. ande ande. hn:: skin is- skin is white.
14	Yuko:	ah I see.
15	Yan:	hm.
16	Yuko:	ohw::=
17	Yan:	=kh. it's amazing when I first came to japan.

18   Yuko: ah::: really. hahahaha.

In line 1, Yan comments on some categorical properties of Japanese girls, but in line 2, Yuko orients to [sɪn] as unintelligible, which initiates a repair sequence. This manifests that the intelligibility of the word expressed through the name [sɪn] has faltered. In line 3, Yan self-repairs her utterance by repeating [sɪn] twice. In line 4, Yuko first deploys the discourse marker "ah," which makes a claim that she has transitioned from a state of not-knowing to a state of knowing, and then proffers a candidate repair pronunciation, [θɪn], segmentally repairing [sɪn] to [θɪn] (O'Neal in press). Yuko furthermore proffers two lexical repair candidates as well: smart and slender. Accordingly, Yan is in a position to affirm either the candidate repair pronunciation, [θɪn], or one of the two lexical repair candidates, smart or slender.

However, in line 5, Yan rejects all three potential candidate repairs, and therefore the repair sequence has neither been concluded nor has intelligibility been restored. In response, in line 6, Yuko deploys another lexical candidate repair, fat, for Yan to affirm or reject. In line 7, Yan again rejects the candidate repair, and then proffers a semantic self-repair: "style." After a quick confirmation insert sequence, Yuko affirms the semantic repair of [sɪn] to "style" in line 10. Although Yuko rejects the idea that Japanese women have good style in line 12, Yan further amends the semantics of [sɪn] to include skin pallidity. That is, the name [sɪn] came to connote both sartorial characteristics and skin pallidity within this interaction, and this was brought about through the efforts of the ELF speaker dyad.

This example further demonstrates that semantics are a negotiable phenomenon. Yan intends [sɪn] to refer to stylishness and white skin, but Yuko interprets [sɪn] as a comment on body proportions. However, both Yan and Yuko negotiate the meaning of [sɪn] and arrive at a mutual understanding of [sɪn] as something closer to Yan's intended meaning. This example shows that semantics are an ad hoc phenomenon; meanings are determined through interaction, not through reference to dictionaries.

The final example also demonstrates that semantics are variable and subject to the vicissitudes of intercultural interaction. In the last example, Bai, a female Taiwanese exchange student who majors in Japanese, and Ayako, a female Japanese university student who majors in economics, are discussing the characteristics of Bai's hometown in Taiwan, which leads to the following exchange.

Example 4:

1   Bai: ch- chinese is (.) jiayi.

2	Ayako:	jiayi.
3	Bai:	yeah.
4	Ayako:	oh. is it [ɚɹvæn] area?
5		(1.3)
6	Bai:	ur::: le. taiwan?
7		(0.2)
8	Ayako:	yeah. taiwan.
9	Bai:	in the:: (0.2) west?
10	Ayako:	we?
11	Bai:	in the west? west of taiwan.
12	Ayako:	yeah.
13	Bai:	yeah. (0.1) so you aks me:?
14		(0.2)
15	Ayako:	ah. I mean your hometown is [ɚɹvæn] area?
16		(0.7)
17	Bai:	oh:: (0.3) over?
18	Ayako:	[ɚɹvæn]. uh it means like uh (.) built up area.
19		(0.4)
20	Bai:	build?
21	Ayako:	built up. area.
22	Bai:	built up?
23	Ayako:	yeah. [ɚɹvæn] uh: I mean uh:: how can I say
24		(2.3)
25	Ayako:	uh does your hometown have a lot of buildings
26		or supermarket?
27		(0.3)
28	Bai:	ah. modern area?
29	Ayako:	ah yeah.

In lines 1～3, Bai and Ayako proceed through a question-answer-confirmation sequence that identifies Bai's hometown in Taiwan, but then in line 4, Ayako asks a further question about Bai's hometown in Taiwan. However, the lack of uptake and the silence in line 5 presages future troubles. This is probably where intelligibility faltered in this example. In lines 6～8, in an attempt to restore intelligibility, Bai and Ayako proceed through an insert sequence to confirm that Ayako's question concerns Taiwan, and then

in line 9, Bai proffers "west" as a lexical repair candidate for [ɚɹvæn], which demonstrates that [ɚɹvæn] is unintelligible to Bai. After a few lines of attempted repair (lines 10~13), Ayako repeats her question in line 15, but the lack of uptake and silence in line 16 again presage interactional trouble. In line 17, Bai again proffers a lexical repair candidate for [ɚɹvæn]: "over." However, in line 18, Ayako self-repairs her question, rewording her query into a definition of [ɚɹvæn]. A few rounds of attempted repair ensue (lines 19~23), and then in line 24, Ayako self-repairs her question, reformulating the original question. In line 25, Bai first deploys the discourse marker "ah," which makes a claim that Bai has moved from a state of not-knowing to knowing, and then proffers a lexical other-repair candidate "modern area" for Ayako to affirm or deny. Last, in line 26, Ayako confirms the other-repair candidate "modern area," which demonstrates that intelligibility has been restored.

Ayako and Bai have repaired [ɚɹvæn], probably an attempt to convey the semantics of the word "urban," to "modern area." This again demonstrates that semantics are negotiated in interaction. Although the semantics expressed through "urban" are close to "modern area," they are not exactly the same. It is true, however, that the semantic proximity between the problematic word and the word finally agreed upon likely contributed to the success of the repair sequence.

5 Discussion

An axiomatic claim about language and language learning is that speakers convey meaning through the forms and functions provided by the language. A further claim derived from the previous claim is the idea that deviation from the standards that compose the forms and functions provided by a language inevitably leads to miscommunication and misunderstanding. But these claims are axiomatic only because they are not questioned, and indeed when examined, the presuppositions that support such thinking fail. But first, let us look at the presuppositions.

According to the traditional view of language and language learning, mutual understanding is made possible because speakers conform their intentions to the symbolic resources that a language permits, which are then sent to another individual. The language represents a system of codes that have reached variety status and are thus standards to be emulated. Standards allow a speaker and an interlocutor to communicate because they can assume that the other aims to communicate through an

intelligible standard. In this view, the phonetic, morphosyntactic, and lexical boundaries of a language set the parameters of what is possible to convey within a language. Ideas have to be conveyed through the communicative resources provided by the language; communication within the vehicle of a language is not possible beyond such resources—in fact, going beyond the resources specified by the language is no longer using the same language.

This is not to say that the traditional view of language is inherently deterministic. The traditional view of language is compatible with the idea that any language can convey any idea, but this view of language is incompatible with the idea that speakers can freely rearrange the phonetic, morphosyntactic, or lexical resources of a language to convey meaning. The traditional view of language would claim that freely rearranging the resources of a language creates a creole—a language to be sure, but a different language nonetheless.

This study claims exactly that—ELF usage is a creole. But ELF is a special kind of creole that is brought into life through the efforts of its speakers. In particular, the semantics of ELF can be changed when it serves the interactional needs of the speakers. Language does not need to conform to the standards of any language to be communicative. Indeed, this study demonstrates that speakers can change the semantics of language to serve their own purposes. Communication is not dependent on conformity. Languages are bundles of resources, but they are not inherently limiting resources. When the resources of the language do not fulfill the purpose of communication, speakers can co-construct new semantics.

Canagarajah (2013) argues that all languages are creoles, and the syncretic nature of language is manifest in the details of an interaction. This study demonstrates that Canagarajah (2013) is correct. Language is syncretic, and meaning in language is manifest through interactions, and is created in interactions. This is all the more so with semantics. The bond between the sign and the signified might be arbitrary, but that does not mean that the language user has to respect that bond—that would be just as arbitrary.

6　Conclusion

In spite of the fact that ELF is actually already ubiquitous, many teachers and students are hostile to ELF. Some arguments mustered against the application of ELF to English

pedagogy are the following: without standards, communication is impossible; without standards, communicating would be much more difficult across cultures, etc. But this is false. What makes communication possible is not the language, but those who speak it. Semantics "work" because a language's speakers make semantics "work."

7 References

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal, 91,* 923-939.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice*. New York: Routledge.

Chomsky, N. (1975). *Syntactic structures* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Walter de Gruyter.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Culler, J. (1987). *Ferdinand de Saussure* (1st ed.). United States: Cornell University Press.

De Saussure, F. (1974). *Cours de linguistique generale*. Paris: Payot.

Halliday, M. (2007). Applied linguistics as an evolving theme. In J. Webster (Ed.) *Language and Education: Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday* (pp. 1-19). London: Continuum.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: new models, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically-based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 83-103.

Kitzinger, C. (2012). In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers, *The handbook of conversation analysis* (iBooks ed.) (pp. 499-603). United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

McBride, P. (2014, December). *Helping East Asian Teachers Consider English as a Lingua Franca*. Paper presented at the IAWE 20th International Conference, New Delhi, India.

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential Analysis of ELF Pronunciation Negotiation Strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 97-114.

Mortensen, J. (2013). Notes on English used as a Lingua Franca as an object of study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *2*(1), 25-46.

Mufwene, S. (2008). *Language Evolution: Contact, Competition and Change*. United Kingdom: Continuum International.

O'Neal, G. (in press). Consonant Clusters and Intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca in Japan. *Journal of Pragmatics and Society*.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied linguistics, 21*, 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A, Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*, 361-382.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trudgill, P. (2001). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*. United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.

Appendix: CA Transcription Symbols

Symbol	Represents
¦	overlapping speech
[	speech in the phonetic transcription of the IPA
¦[	overlapping speech in the phonetic transcription of the IPA
=	latched utterance (e.g., no silence between the utterances)
(.)	micro silence (e.g., less than one tenth of a second of silence)
(1.5)	a timed silence (e.g., a one and a half seconds of silence)
hahaha	laughter
-	sudden cut off of speech
:	elongated sound
.	falling intonation
,	slightly rising intonation
?	rising intonation
↑	sudden volume increase and/or pitch
°word°	speech that is noticeably quieter than the surrounding speech
>word<	speech that is said faster than the surrounding speech
<word>	speech that is said slower than the surrounding speech