
L2 Teaching in the Wild: A Closer Look at Correction and Explanation Practices in Everyday L2 Interaction

GUÐRÚN THEODÓRSDÓTTIR

University of Iceland, Faculty of Icelandic and Comparative Cultural Studies, School of Humanities, 101 Reykjavik, Iceland Email: gt@hi.is

This article argues for a reconceptualization of the concept of ‘corrective feedback’ for the investigation of correction practices in everyday second language (L2) interaction (‘in the wild’). Expanding the dataset for L2 research as suggested by Firth and Wagner (1997) to include interactions from the wild has consequences for the traditional concept of corrective feedback, which comes from classroom dyads of native speakers and nonnative speakers and focuses on a native speaker’s correction of a linguistic error in an L2 speaker’s turn. Correction practices in the wild, however, are co-constructed and predominantly initiated by the L2 learner herself. The study also shows that explanation practices are initiated by the L2 speaker or otherwise occasioned and that they emerge following a lack of understanding on the part of the L2 speaker during a correction episode. The data reveal no examples of L2 teaching in the wild as correction or explanation practices that are not occasioned, that is, they do not come ‘out of the blue.’ I will argue that L2 teaching practitioners might benefit from more awareness of the circumstances that occasion and sustain correction and explanation practices.

Keywords: CA–SLA; repair; corrective feedback; L2 teaching in the wild; L2 learning in the wild

THE NOTION OF CORRECTION HAS BEEN studied in detail in second language acquisition (SLA) research as a feedback practice, that is, a practice in which second language (L2) speakers receive feedback on their output by first language (L1) speakers in interactional dyads. These dyads are often referred to as native speaker–nonnative speaker (NS–NNS) talk and staged primarily as information gap tasks for research purposes, or they consist of teacher–student interactions. The focus in this research has been on instances of erroneous language use by an L2 learner and the subsequent reaction of the L1 speaker or the language expert in such dyads. In particular, this reaction to the erroneous turn by the L1 speaker has been targeted as this is where the feedback is located. Designed to provide the L2 learner with feedback on the correctness of her output, this

reaction is a correction that, to varying degrees, indicates that an error was made, indexes the error, provides the correct alternative, and/or presents an explanation in the form of metalinguistic feedback (N. Ellis, 1994; R. Ellis, 2009; R. Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Goo & Mackey, 2013). In other words, corrective feedback ranges from implicit to explicit—from recasts to explicit corrections—and may or may not include an explanation. A recast is a reformulation of an erroneous turn in which the error is corrected but without singling out the error itself, whereas explicit corrections point out the error and may include a negative assessment (e.g., ‘no, not goed—went,’ to use an example from R. Ellis et al., 2006, p. 341).

The present article uses conversation analysis (CA) to investigate corrections and explanations as they are carried out in L2 interaction in the wild, that is, in everyday, out-of-classroom talk, and questions the empirical validity of applying corrective feedback practices to research on such data. Epistemologically, the notion of

feedback is problematic because it derives from teaching; feedback is something a teacher (or another expert) gives a student (or another novice) on her educational achievement. In everyday interaction, on the other hand, the participants are engaged in talk that has real-life consequences, so the primary purpose of the encounters is to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity while learning is of a secondary nature (Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011). Language production is not typically seen as an achievement that occasions assessments; however, as will be shown in the data, showing understanding of a corrected item may do just that.

CORRECTION VERSUS REPAIR

Corrections are rare outside of educational contexts (Gardner & Wagner, 2004), and if they happen, they are formatted so as to intervene minimally in the ongoing interaction (Brouwer, Rasmussen, & Wagner, 2004; Kurhila, 2001), or they emerge as co-constructed practices in which the correctable item is isolated and repaired in a side sequence following repair initiation on the part of the L2 speaker (Brouwer, 2003, 2004). This brings me to the difference between ‘correction’ and ‘repair.’ Repair has been widely described, especially in the CA tradition, since Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks (1977). In CA terms, repair is an array of practices that people can employ to deal with trouble in understanding, hearing, or producing talk. Repair is the preferred analytic term rather than ‘correction’ because it does not necessarily have anything to do with objective errors. As will become clear in the data analysis, however, repair in L2 talk will often result in novel contributions or corrections from the L1 speaker.

As summarized in Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008), we distinguish among four types of repair depending on who initiates repair and who carries it out. We use the terms ‘self’ and ‘other’ to denote who does what, so repair can be self- or other-initiated and carried out by ‘self’ or ‘other.’ This yields four types: (a) self-initiated self-repair (the current speaker initiates and carries out repair, as in, for example, a restart); (b) other-initiated self-repair (the current recipient initiates repair, for example by way of a comprehension check, and the first speaker carries out the repair); (c) self-initiated other-repair (the current speaker initiates repair, for example in the form of a word search, and the recipient carries out the repair); and (d) other-initiated other-repair (the current recipient initiates and carries out repair, for example in the form of an explicit correction).

Generally, there is an interactional preference for self-repair (Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996; Schegloff et al., 1977) and my data are no exception. This means that corrections in the wild are predominantly self-initiated other-repairs. In other words, the L2 speaker typically ‘invites’ her co-participant to carry out a repair. This is fundamentally different from the focus and findings in the corrective feedback literature. There, the notion of correction concerns the L1 speaker’s action as a response to an error in the L2 speaker’s turn whether or not the L2 speaker indicated a request for the correction. In CA such a correction is interchangeable with ‘other-initiated other-repair,’ and while it is not brought about sequentially by the L2 speaker, it only occurs in my data when the L2 speaker has already made her identity as an L2 learner public (see Excerpt 6 in the data analysis section). A central issue in this article is to describe how repair work, including corrections and explanations, is accomplished in the wild and how this relates to learning and teaching.

Instead of focusing primarily on the practice as one of an L1 speaker, or a language expert or teacher, providing feedback to L2 users, the CA stance taken here implies investigating these phenomena as co-constructed endeavors, crucially dependent on the L2 user’s actions in the form of initiation of and reaction to the repair. CA methods, including Membership Categorization Analysis, to be explained in the next section, enable the analysis of those instances in detail for a better understanding of how they are organized and lead to a rethinking in social terms of correction and explanation practices as well as noticing (Schmidt, 1990, 2001): Corrections and explanations only work when oriented and agreed to as such by the L2 user through her initiations and uptakes, which in turn function as socially visible displays of noticing (Eskildsen, 2018a, 2018b; Eskildsen & Markee, 2018; Greer, 2018).

CA-SLA AND MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIZATION ANALYSIS

As pointed out in the introduction to this issue, conversation analytic SLA research, also known as CA-SLA, has produced a wealth of insights into learning as social action, learning in communities of practice, and development of interactional competence. Demonstrating that learnables and teachables are made relevant interactionally in the correction and explanation practices under investigation, this article adds to the research on learning as social action, that is, locally established

practices in which the interactants display their orientation to the goings-on as learning through various accountable actions of orienting to understanding or using something new (e.g., Brouwer, 2003; Eskildsen, 2018b; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010).

An important piece of epistemological baggage concerns CA–SLA's stance on identity and the emic perspective (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kasper & Wagner, 2011). The emic perspective on data implies investigating interaction and learning from a participant-relevant viewpoint. Data analysis is always based on participants' orientations to actions in interaction, and through this perspective it is revealed to us, as analysts, which identities are relevant to the participants at any point in an ongoing interaction. Participants' identities, in other words, are co-constructed; there is no *a priori* 'being an L2 learner'; rather, that identity can be made relevant through participants' conduct *in situ*. Identity is something you *do*, not something you *are*. This is in contrast with SLA research based on the NS–NNS dyads referred to earlier, where 'novice' and 'expert' identities are stable and objective facts; people are either NNSs or NSs, either 'learners' or 'teachers.' In the data I present in this article, the identity work is quite simple in the sense that the L2 speaker is never co-constructed as having the 'expert' identity, but in other research it has been shown that such identity work is negotiable, fluid, and complex as L2 speakers may disaffiliate with any status of being 'learners' (Firth, 2009), or they may act as locally designated experts and even challenge the expert status of L1 speakers (Eskildsen, 2018b; Theodórsdóttir, 2018b).

In addition to CA's emic perspective I also draw on the notion of category-bound activities from Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA; Sacks, 1972; Stokoe, 2012) to investigate L2 learning and teaching in the wild; I identify actions that show the L2 speaker and the L1 speaker appearing as a learner and a teacher, respectively. MCA, like CA, is rooted in ethnomethodology and is concerned with people's actions as recognizably belonging to particular types of people, members of certain categories. Membership categories may be used by members of a society to categorize persons, that is, a teacher, a child, a cook, and so forth. Of primary importance here are category-bound activities that are characteristic of a category's members, for example, teaching is a category-bound activity of the category 'teacher.' Because certain category-bound activi-

ties are linked to specific membership categories they are important in the analytic work to determine identities.

SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING IN THE WILD

Language learning in the wild has been attracting research attention recently. Studies of L2 learning in naturalistic settings are part of SLA's long-term baggage (e.g., Schmidt, 1983; Schumann, 1976), but the focus is different here. The term 'wild' is borrowed from Hutchins (1995) who used it to indicate that his research on cognition as situated, locally embedded, and co-constructed took place outside the reach of researchers' controlled experiments in labs. Here, it is used in the sense that I, as researcher, did not decide on or determine the nature of my data (Barraja–Rohan, 2015; Eskildsen, 2018a, this issue; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b; Wagner, 2015). Instead, this research uses data from everyday settings to understand the social fabric of L2 learning (Hellermann et al., 2018). Some research on L2 interactional competence, although not framed as language learning in the wild, is carried out in the same vein and under similar epistemological considerations (see Pekarek Doehler & Pochon–Berger, 2015, for a recent overview).

Research on learning in the wild has revealed that L2 speakers massively engage in word searches and publicly notice new items (Brouwer, 2003; Eskildsen, 2018a this issue, 2018b, Greer, 2018; Kurhila, 2006; Lilja, 2014; Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011). Mapping out a range of learning behaviors in the wild, Eskildsen (2018b) showed how word search practices leave experiential traces in the L2 speakers as they re-index the recently learned items in subsequent talk, and how word searches can be used by L2 speakers to preempt upcoming trouble as they ask their L1 speaking peers for particular words immediately before going on to use them. Research has also shown that L2 speakers can develop their interactional repertoire, for example their story-telling skills, through L2 encounters in the wild (Barraja–Rohan, 2015; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016), and that they may exploit service encounters for practicing and learning the new language (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b). So far, however, this research has largely ignored the teaching that more or less explicitly accompanies learning. This article addresses that balance as it takes a closer look at

correction and explanation practices in everyday L2 interaction.

DATA

The data are transcribed audio recordings of everyday conversations in L2 Icelandic, recorded weekly by Anna, a Canadian L2 learner of Icelandic. Anna studied Icelandic at the University of Iceland in Reykjavik and volunteered to record her daily life interactions outside of the classroom. Anna's recordings contain private conversations with her friends as well as service encounters from bakeries, cafés, the bank, and so forth. She delivered approximately 20 minutes a week for a period of 3 years. Only the first year is transcribed and available for analysis. Data from the same database, ICEBASE, which is accessible from talkbank.org, have been used in previous research to investigate practices for L2 learning in the wild (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b; Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011).

The data collection began in 2005. The use of audio recording equipment (as opposed to video) was a conscious decision, mostly because the available technology at the time did not allow for easy and on-the-fly video recording. Therefore, embodied conduct unfortunately cannot be taken into account, which means that the analyses in this article are not exhaustive; there are, for example, pauses and deictic uses in the data that video might have helped explain.

In previous research drawing on Anna's recordings (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2010, 2011a, 2011b; Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011), I have reported that, because English is so widely spoken in Iceland, interaction in L2 Icelandic, especially in service encounters, does not happen by itself; it has to be made to happen and sometimes even struggled for. Anna did this, for example, by making and insisting on language contracts with clerks in service encounters, which helped her construct learning spaces in the wild (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017). She was, in other words, persistent in her pursuit of interacting in the new language and often engaged in activities with a linguistic focus, that is, language learning activities. In the following section I will show how such activities emerge as Anna and her co-participants collaboratively build and carry out correction and explanation practices around emergent learnables and teachables. Transcription conventions can be found in the Appendix.

DATA ANALYSIS

Correction as Self-Initiated Other-Repair

The first excerpt (1), from a recording between Anna and an Icelandic man, shows an example of how corrections in the form of self-initiated other-repairs run off interactionally, while also indicating the pervasiveness of English in Iceland that I pointed out in the preceding section. The sequence in the excerpt happens toward the end of a longer interaction. Prior to line 1 in the excerpt, the Icelandic man says to Anna, just before they part company, that the next time they meet, she will speak fluent Icelandic. He delivers this compliment in Icelandic and then, upon request from Anna, in English. Anna's response, beginning at line 1, is that she looks forward to that; however, as we shall see, it takes some effort for her to accomplish that response.

EXCERPT 1: Self-Initiated Other-Repair

01	AN:	yeah I d- I uh (.) é:g	
02	IM:	hehe [(he)]	I
03	AN:	[hé-] hé- (0.6) hja- (0.2) hjal- (0.4) hla-	
04	IM:	já	
		yes	
05	AN:	I look forward	
06		(0.3)	
07	IM:	já	
		yes	
08	AN:	[hlo-]	
09	IM:	[hla-] hlakk- hla[kka]	
		loo- look- look forward	
10	AN:	[hla]kka	
		look forward	
11	IM:	hlakka t[il]	
		look forward to	
12	AN:	[é:] ég hlakka (0.3) til .h (.)	
		I I look forward to	
13		þetta:(0.4) tími	
		this time	
14	IM:	já [hehehehehehe]	
		yes	
15	AN:	[hehehehehehe .h]	

Anna also begins her turn in English but switches to Icelandic and, following the production of *ég* ('I') and mutual laughter, she runs into trouble (1–3). The trouble is seen in pauses and cut-offs which can lead to repair (Brouwer, 2004; Schegloff et al., 1977). At this stage, however, it is not clear what Anna is saying, so repair cannot be carried out by the co-participant; in order to do repair, one needs to understand what the trouble is and be able to fix it (Brouwer et al., 2004). So the co-participant's turn at line 4 can be heard as a continuer, an invitation to Anna to go on, which

she does by switching to English, *I look forward* (5). A pause ensues (6), following which the Icelandic man provides yet another continuer (7). At this stage, he is not orienting to Anna's use of English as a request for help (Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011) but, showing understanding, seems to be waiting for her to continue. In overlap with Anna's continuation (8), the Icelandic man then begins doing the repair as he provides Anna with the Icelandic word for 'look forward,' *hlakka* (9). Following a public noticing and pick-up from Anna (10), he repeats and adds the preposition, *til* ('to') (11), enabling Anna to restart and finish her turn from line 1. She does so by repeating *ég* ('I') and using the newly provided items *hlakka til* to produce 'I look forward to that time' in Icelandic (lines 12–13). The sequence is closed with an acknowledgment token from the Icelandic man and mutual laughter (lines 14–15).

The excerpt is an example of a word search initiated by the L2 speaker through turn-design (pauses and other signs of productional trouble) and the use of another, shared language (Eskildsen, 2018a this issue, 2018b; Kurhila, 2006; Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011;). In this case, the use of English did not immediately foster other-repair, which is testament to the widespread occurrence of English in Iceland. But overall, the example follows the typical sequential progression of word searches, from initiation through delivery, of the sought-for item and public noticing and pick-up of the item to continuation of the topic by the L2 speaker (Eskildsen, 2018b). Of particular importance here is that the L1 speaker's contribution, the other-repair, follows an invitation from the L2 speaker and is subsequently oriented to as a repair by the L2 speaker. A correction in the wild is, in other words, a collaborative practice that is occasioned, and an investigation of correction practices in the wild therefore requires a modification of the concept of correction as understood in the corrective feedback literature to go beyond the act of correcting per se and include the previous and next turns. The remainder of the analyses explores in more detail this collaborative and occasioned nature of corrections (and explanations) in the wild.

Next, I will show an example of a word search that turns into more complex repair work (Excerpts 2a–d). Anna and her friend are making a car trip, and Anna makes an on-line commentary (1–2).¹

Anna's commentary is trouble-filled. When she seems to run out of words (1–2), her friend steps in with a scaffolding infinitive marker, *að* (3), which is a continuation of the syntactic structure

EXCERPT 2a: Extended Word Search

01	AN:	okay	uh:m:	(0.5)	við	erum	í	bíl	(1.7)
									<i>we are in a-car</i>
02		við	(2.0)	erum:	(2.4)	uh:::			
		we		are					
03	FR:	a[ð]							
		to							
04	AN:	[að]	að	að	búin	(0.9)	bílferð?		
		to	to	to	finished		car-travel		
05		(0.7)							
06	FR:	uh:	nei	við	erum	að	keyra,		
			no	we	are		to drive		
			no	we	are		driving		
07		(1.2)							
08	FR:	e:ða	(0.2)	við	erum	í	bíltúr.		
		or					<i>we are in a-car-trip</i>		
		or					<i>we are making a car trip</i>		

EXCERPT 2b: Extended Word Search

09		(1.2)							
10	FR:	it's	like	(0.3)	uh:::	ca:r	tra-	(0.3)	
11		tour	(0.5)	car	tour	(0.2)	bí:ltúr.		
							<i>a car-trip</i>		
12	AN:	bíltúr	(.)	uh:::					
		<i>a car-trip</i>							
13	FR:	bí:ltúr.							
		<i>a car trip</i>							
14		(0.7)							

in Anna's turn. Anna picks it up in partial overlap and continues her commentary, which ends in a word search; following a 0.9 second pause, Anna delivers the word *bílferð* ('car travel') with rising intonation that may indicate uncertainty. Known as try-marking (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), this particular intonation pattern is common in word searches (Brouwer, 2003; Eskildsen, 2018a this issue, 2018a; Kurhila, 2006; Theodórsdóttir, 2018a). Her friend orients to the try-marking and offers a negative assessment, but he does more than that as he provides a correction of Anna's entire turn, *nei við erum að keyra* ('no we are driving'), suggesting that he also orients to her non-standard use of 'búin' ('finished'). Following a lengthy pause, he adds an alternative, *eda við erum í bíltúr* ('or we are making a car trip') (8).

The friend has now provided Anna with two ways of formulating a commentary about currently driving around, in addition to providing her with a candidate solution to her word search as he repairs *bílferð* ('car travel') to *bíltúr* ('car trip'). The correction (self-initiated other-repair) therefore concerns the difference between having

finished driving around and currently driving around as well as the nonstandard *bílferð* ('car travel'). Anna, however, shows no sign of understanding at this stage; recall that she had signaled trouble with the word *bílferð* ('car travel'; 4) and may thus be expecting the friend to attend to that word in isolation. His help, offering alternatives, may be too complex at this point for her to understand and use. In the next excerpt we see him focus on the very word Anna needed help with (10–11). He does so in English but delivers the key word in Icelandic, *bíltúr* ('car trip'), at the end of the turn.

He has now made the sought-for word available for Anna to pick up, which she does at line 12. The friend confirms by repeating the word himself. Now the matter might be resolved, but as outlined in the analysis of Excerpt 1, word searches usually become complete when the word search initiator (here, Anna) uses the new item to move the interaction forward. Perhaps Anna is attempting this already at line 12 when she produces a prolonged *uh*, but what happens instead is that the friend re-introduces his earlier contribution *bara að keyra um* ('just driving around') (Excerpt 2c, line 15).

EXCERPT 2c: Extended Word Search

- 15 FR: *bara að keyra um.*
just to drive around
just driving around
- 16 (0.6)
- 17 AN: *að keyra um:=*
to drive around
driving around
- 18 FR: *=j[á]*
yes
- 3 lines omitted
- 22 AN: *að keyra um: (0.3) UH::M:: (0.3) ts*
to drive around
driving around
- 23 (1.1) *h ° how do you say we (.) are making a car trip °*
- 24 (0.3) *or or=*
- 25 FR: *=ERUM í bíltúr (.) ERUM (.) Í (.) BÍL (0.2) túr.*
are (1st pers. pl.) in a car trip are in a-car trip
are making a car trip are making a car trip
- 26 (0.4)
- 27 AN: *erum í bíltúr,*
are (1st pers. pl.) in a-car-trip
are making a car trip
- 28 FR: *já [bíhltú]hr.*
yes car-trip
- 29 AN: *[ERUM Í] (.) bí:túhr.*
are(1st pers. pl.) in a-car-trip
are making a car trip
- 30 FR: *já:*
yes
- 31 AN: *erum í °bíhltúhr.°*
are (1st pers. pl.) in a-car-trip
are making a car trip
- 32 (2.9)
-

This time Anna repeats *að keyra um* ('driving around') and the friend confirms (17–18), and then, following some omitted talk, she asks in a low volume, *how do you say we are making a car trip* (22–24). This shows that despite her uptake of the elements offered by the friend she does not treat them as a valid candidate solution to her word search. The friend replies, in raised volume, *erum í bíltúr* ('are on a car trip'), and this is followed by repetitions from Anna and confirmations from the friend (27–31).

Next, in the omitted lines (Excerpt 2d), the friend offers yet another alternative before Anna returns to the phrase she originally asked for and was provided with, *erum í bíltúr* ('are making a car trip') (44). The friend's response can be seen as an embedded correction, or a recast in the corrective feedback literature; he confirms and repeats but adds the personal pronoun *við* (we) (44–45). In line with previous research showing that embedded repairs are not designed to yield a linguistic focus (Brouwer et al., 2004), Anna does not orient to the friend's turn as a correction. Rather, they both treat the word search as resolved, and the topical interaction is resumed.

EXCERPT 2d: Extended Word Search

((11 lines omitted))

44	AN:	<i>erum íbíltúr.</i> are(1st pers. pl.) in a car trip <i>are making a car trip</i>
45	FR:	>já< <i>við erum íbíhltúhr.</i> yes we are in a car trip <i>yes we are making a car trip</i>

Summing up, the main point here is that language learning/teaching in the wild can be hugely complex and unpredictable, and therefore it requires, on the part of the participants, a constant monitoring of the co-participant's turns. This monitoring is particularly evident in the syntactic co-construction in lines 1–4, but essentially it is visible in all the repeats and acknowledgments. Excerpt 1 showed a smooth practice of correction and uptake in which the Icelandic term for 'look forward to' emerged as a noticeable and a learnable. Excerpts 2a–d, on the other hand, show a more trouble-filled example where the explicit correction did not immediately lead to understanding or acceptance from the L2 speaker. This was evident in Anna asking for the Icelandic term for making a car trip even after the friend had offered her two candidate ways of saying that. It seems that giving un-called for alternatives in word searches makes things unnecessarily

complex and is tantamount to disalignment between the L1 speaker and the L2 speaker, which makes it difficult to co-construct learnables. Support for this can be found in Anna's return to what transpired as a co-constructed learnable in this situation, *erum íbíltúr* ('are making a car trip'). The extended nature of the word search in Excerpts 2a–d indicates the importance of the L2 speaker's actions; without her displayed understanding and acceptance of a candidate solution the word search remains incomplete.

Occasioned Vocabulary Teaching

The next excerpt (3) is an instance of a repair sequence with an L2 teaching trajectory. Volunteering at the ticket counter in a local cinema, Anna is talking to a customer (CU) and in line 1 she states *þetta er laus* ('this is free/available'). The customer does not seem to respond so, following pauses, Anna repeats her utterance from line 1 *þetta er laus* ('this is free/available') at both lines 3 and 5. As may be inferred from the translation, the Icelandic word 'laus' means 'free' as in 'available.' As we shall see, Anna's intended meaning

EXCERPT 3: Occasioned Vocabulary Teaching'

01	AN:	<i>þetta er laus.</i> <i>this is free/available</i>
02	(1.6)	
03	AN:	<i>þetta er laus:.</i>
04	(3.1)	
05	AN:	<i>þetta er LAUSS it is free</i> <i>this is free/available</i>
06	(0.5)	
07	CU:	<i>oh okei (xxx xx xxxxx xxx)</i> <i>okay</i>
08	(3.8)	
09	AN:	<i>that's also free laus.</i> <i>free/available</i>
10	(0.7)	
11	CU:	<i>uh: nei</i> <i>no</i>
12	AN:	<i>nei that's for free.</i> <i>no</i>
13	CU:	<i>uh:m ókeypis</i> <i>free of charge</i>
14	(0.3)	
15	CU:	<i>ókeypis</i> <i>free of charge</i>
16	(2.0)	
17	CU:	<i>ókeypis (xxx)</i> <i>free of charge</i>
18	(1.8)	
19	AN:	<i>ókeypis ókeypis þetta er ókeypis uh: uh:</i> <i>free of charge free of charge this is free of charge</i>
20	CU:	<i>já (xx)</i> <i>yes</i>
21	AN:	<i>þetta er kók og popkorn er uh:m (1.3) uh: niu</i> <i>this is coke and pop-corn is nine</i>
22	(1.3)	<i>hundrað og og fimt(i)u</i> <i>hundred and fifty</i>

Despite her displays of trouble and her try-marking intonation on the final item, *borð* ('table') at line 1, a typical word search format as discussed earlier, no action is forthcoming from the friend. Anna makes another attempt, and then the friend delivers an other-repair, *leggja áborð* ('set the table') (4). This provides Anna with the apt expression for her purpose, but in the infinitive form. Anna displays her noticing of the repair as she attempts to repeat the new words before using them in context, *ég leggja borð* ('I set-infinitive table') (6). Following a pause, the friend carries out repair again (7–8; Excerpt 4b).

EXCERPT 4b: Word Search and Grammar Teaching

07 (0.8)
 08 FR: *ég legg á borð*
I set (1st person singular) on the table
I set the table
 09 (0.3)
 10 AN: *ég leggja*
I set-on
 11 (0.4)
 12 FR: *legg.*
set (1st person singular)
 13 (1.1)

His repair *ég legg áborð* ('I set (on) the table') is a correction of Anna's attempt from line 6, targeting both the verb form and a missing preposition; Anna used the infinitive form of the verb and lacked the preposition *á* ('on'), which is required to make the expression complete in Icelandic. Although the friend has now provided Anna with a full expression to pick up and use, Anna, in turn, only delivers a partial repetition of his words, *ég leggja* (10). The friend's response is another correction that isolates the verb, indicating that he hears Anna's trouble as being about distinguishing between the verb *legg* ('put') and the preposition plus the verb *legg á* ('put on'). Anna shows no orientation to the friend's correction (13) and the friend then resorts to a more linguistically oriented focus (14, Excerpt 4c).

EXCERPT 4c: Word Search and Grammar Teaching

14 FR: *leggja að leggja og ég legg.*
set-infinitive to set and I set
 15 (0.4)
 16 AN: *pú*
you
 17 (0.7)
 18 FR: *á borð*
on table

The friend takes the turn with a selection of conjugations of the verb *leggja* ('set'): *leggja að leggja og ég legg* ('set-infinitive to set and I set'). This looks like a grammar lesson presenting the base form of the verb *leggja* ('set'), followed by the infinitive and the first person singular form. The friend has now adopted the role of a grammar teacher as we see in his category-bound actions; he has gone from correcting to running Anna through the relevant grammatical forms.

In line 16 Anna utters *pú* ('you'), which may signal an attempt at continuing the grammar lesson; she may be trying to elicit the second person singular form of the verb. We do not know, however, if this is the case, because, following a 0.7 second pause, the friend continues with *áborð* ('on table') which abandons the grammar lesson and instead completes his prior turn syntactically, *ég legg áborð* ('I set on the table'). He has now isolated the prepositional phrase, which should make the preposition stand out as an independent item rather than attached to the verb as we saw in Anna's utterance at line 10. Next, at line 20, Excerpt 4d, Anna starts her turn with 'okay,' which can be heard as a sign of understanding of the prior turn (18) but also as a beginning of something new.

EXCERPT 4d: Word Search and Grammar Teaching

19 (0.4)
 20 AN: *okei ég er að* (0.4) [*leggja*]
okay I am to set
okay I am setting
 21 FR: [*leggja*]
set-infinitive
setting
 22 (0.5)
 23 AN: *og ég legg* (0.3) [*borð*]
and I set table
 24 FR: [*uh*]
 25 (1.3)
 26 FR: *og ég ætla að leggja á* [*borð*]
and I am going to set on table
and I am going to set the table
 27 AN: [*já*] *ég ætla að*
yes I am going to
 28 *leggja^o já*
set yes

Then she continues with *ég er að* (0.4) *leggja* ('I am setting'). This is a reformulation of the previous attempts to say 'I set,' which is actually better fitted, pragmatically, to the situation, as she is talking about the immediate present. The friend overlaps her utterance of the key word *leggja* ('put') (21), and Anna and the friend now seem to have solved the issue of stating Anna's action of

Anna's second repeat with nonstandard pronunciation repeat rather than the first one which was standard, albeit try-marked. Anna produces *ah*, a change-of-state token, followed by a repetition of the friend's utterance, 'only one ell,' and *okay*. She is showing understanding here which should be the end of the matter but the friend overlaps her utterance of okay with *UH: bill* ('car [nominative]') (14).

The friend's action in line 14 is curious as the problem had to do with the pronunciation of *bíl* ('car [accusative]'), but here he gives her the nominative form of the word which has a different pronunciation than the focus form *bíl* ('car [accusative]'). Anna's reaction in line 16 is partly inaudible but from the first part it seems that she is attempting to produce some form of the word, possibly a repeat of the friend's *bill* ('car [nominative]'). At line 18, following a half second pause, the friend appears as a language teacher as he explains, switching between Icelandic and English, *u:h um bí:l ít's lí:ke uh (1.4) uh:: (.) þolfall* ('about a car it's like accusative').³ Here the friend engages in a category-bound activity of a language teacher using grammatical terminology ('accusative') and a preposition, *um* ('about'), which governs the accusative, to explain the problem. This suggests that his action in line 14 is the beginning of a list with the four cases; he gives the nominative, *bíll* ('car'), and then he continues at line 18 with the next case, accusative. While his actions are not called for by Anna, they seem to be an upgrade of his previous explanation of the rules of pronunciation, which did not quite result in the achievement of intersubjectivity. The tentative nature of his turn and his erroneous application of the case terms (see note 3), however, suggest that he is uncertain.

The next relevant action is for Anna to respond, but when no action is forthcoming (21), the friend continues by translating the grammatical term into English, which shows him treating Anna's lack of response as nonunderstanding. Anna then signals understanding, *yeah okay* tokens, and agreement with the reason for the need for the accusative, *we are in the car right*, indicated by her stressing the word *in* (lines 22–24). The friend utters *yeah* in partial overlap with Anna's production of the word *right*. The teaching has been successful. The final part is Anna repeating her initial utterance (from line 3) using the corrected form of the word for car ('*bíl* (accusative)'). Anna has not only claimed understanding (22) but displayed understanding as well (24–26).

This is an example where a friend takes on the role as a teacher using techniques and terms from the classroom to explain linguistic issues, in this case the use and pronunciation of the accusative form of *bíl* ('car [accusative]'). The explanation may have been occasioned by Anna's hesitant production and unframing of *bill* (4) and subsequent uncertain uptakes (7, 9). Both Excerpts 4 and 5 are examples of L1 speakers providing Anna with linguistic forms (Excerpts 4 and 5) and metalinguistic explanations (Excerpt 5). In both cases, as is representative of the data set as a whole, the practice is occasioned by inconclusive repair work. In the first case, the L1 speaker displayed an understanding of Anna's repetition of the sought-for item *ég legg á borð* ('I set the table') as problematic, and in the second example Anna displayed trouble in repeating a corrected item. In both cases the L1 speaker engaged in category-bound behavior of a language teacher.

Correction as Other-Initiated Other-Repair

The final excerpt (6) shows a rare example of a correction in the form of an other-initiated other-repair where the practice is not sequentially initiated by the L2 speaker. In this excerpt Anna is talking to a guide on a field trip, and in line 1 she asks the question *hvað erum við* ('what are we'). Rather than responding to the question, the guide corrects her, replacing *hvað* ('what') with *hvar* ('where'), *hvar erum við* ('where are we') (2).

EXCERPT 6a: Other-Initiated Other-Repair

-
- 01 AN: <hvað erum við>.
 what are we
- 02 GU: hvar (.) erum við.
 where are we
- 03 AN: HV↑A:R erum við.
 where are we
- 04 GU: nákvæmlega.
 exactly
-

The guide's response singles out the repairable through productional means: stress on the repairable and unframing of the repairable via a micropause (Brouwer, 2004). In any case, Anna does not have any trouble understanding what is going on, and her uptake (3) has several productional features that show her noticing of the target item such as louder volume, stress, pitch reset, and lengthening of the vowel. She understands

and accepts the guide's offer of the new word, and in turn he assesses the uptake positively (4). This shows the guide as a language teacher; he engages in a category-bound activity of a teacher who is assessing the performance of the learner.

The interaction then continues (Excerpt 6b), but Anna does not understand the word *nákvæmlega* ('exactly'), which results in an unresolved repair sequence (omitted lines). Then the guide picks up the thread from the earlier focus on the interrogative pronoun as a learnable and teachable and, by way of a designedly incomplete utterance, a well-known elicitation procedure from the L2 classroom (Koshik, 2002), he invites Anna to finish the turn with *erum við* ('are we') (11–12).

EXCERPT 6b: Return to the Corrected Item

((6 lines omitted))

- 11 GU: hva::r.
where
- 12 AN: erum (.) við.
are we
- 13 GU: (flott)=
great
- 14 AN: =hvar erum við.
where are we
- 15 GU: já á nesjavöllum
yes in nesjavöllir
- 16 við erum á nesjavöllum
we are in nesjavöllir
-

They have now in cooperation produced *hvar erum við* ('where are we'), which is a repeat of Anna's original question with a correction from the language expert. The guide has made no attempt at answering Anna's question; rather, he has oriented to linguistic matters in a side sequence (Brouwer, 2004; Jefferson, 1972), and he is still in the role of a language teacher/expert as he seems to assess Anna's performance in Icelandic (13). This completes the sequence as an initiation–response–feedback sequence (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In line 14 Anna repeats the corrected question, and the guide finally responds with their location (15–18). The side sequence in which the participants orient to the language rather than the topic therefore ends at line 13 and the topical interaction continues at line 14.

Even in the case of other-initiated other-repairs such as this, where corrective work is sequentially initiated by the L1 speaker, the key to understanding the practice still rests on the visible collabora-

tion of the L2 speaker. Understanding the data from an emic perspective, the action by the L1 speaker in the second turn in the practice cannot be considered a correction unless oriented to as such by the L2 speaker. Moreover, the practice has the distinctive feature of a concluding assessment from the L1 speaker, which makes it resemble the classic initiation–response–feedback pattern from the foreign language classroom, as mentioned. A prototypical correction in the form of other-initiated other repair, in other words, is a collaborative practice that has the following sequential architecture:

1. correction (other-initiated other repair) by L1 speaker
2. uptake by L2 speaker
3. assessment by L1 speaker

CONCLUSION

This investigation has invited a reconceptualization in social terms of the concept of correction. A correction by an L1 speaker only gets its life when oriented to as such by the L2 speaker, typically in the next turn. What is meant is not that there are no cognitive processes involved, but that these processes become visible in particular social practices as particular kinds of behavior. The acts of teaching/learning are socially displayed in situ as items are made interactionally relevant as teachables/learnables. Implicit in this is also a social reconceptualization of Schmidt's notion of 'noticing' (Schmidt, 1990); as Eskildsen & Wagner (2015) pointed out, repair work in L2 interaction leads to noticing, a finding that has been further substantiated and also shown to have long-term repercussions for learning (Eskildsen, 2018b).

As the data have shown, teaching in the wild often occurs following some lack of response on the part of the L2 speaker as a last part of a repair/correction sequence. In terms of what is being taught we can say that attending to vocabulary is the most common focus in those teaching activities as they are in word searches in general (Brouwer, 2003; Eskildsen, 2018b; Theodórsdóttir, 2018a). However we have also seen cases of grammar teaching, for example morphology (Excerpt 5a), case (Excerpt 5b), and conjugations (Excerpt 4d), and I also have examples of pronunciation corrections in my data (not shown due to space considerations). This corroborates the findings in Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir (2017) where the same focal learner, Anna, learned the

situated grammar of ordering a hot dog and in Eskildsen (2018b), which showed an example where the previous learning of the gender for the Danish word for 'tissue' was re-indexed in a later conversation. Brouwer (2004), who showed the sequential progression of doing pronunciation, should also be mentioned here as a study that demonstrated that, although word searches seem to predominantly concern lexis, other aspects of language learning may happen as part of the same practice. These findings are perhaps a result of studies on languages with other structural properties than English; if so, then it shows the need for more studies on repair practices in L2 interactions in a wider range of languages. In any case, I note that there is accumulating evidence that informal conversation is a rich resource for learning various aspects of the L2 (see Eskildsen, 2018a this issue, and Theodórsdóttir, 2018a for further discussion).

This study has shown that the emic (participant-relevant) perspective is essential for understanding the social nature of correction practices in the wild. They cannot be reduced to any one individual turn-at-talk, but need to be understood as a sequential accomplishment starting with an initiation and ending in a common understanding that the activity is accomplished. Using etic (researcher-relevant) concepts based on singular turns-at-talk (correction, recast) is not sufficient to describe correction practices as social accomplishment. Therefore, to investigate correction practices in the wild it is necessary to go beyond the notion of a correction as a teacher's action to an understanding that acknowledges the sequential basis of the architecture of intersubjectivity (Heritage, 1984b).

Both participants in the interaction actively take part in correction episodes, which are initiated (usually) by the L2 speaker; they are occasioned and never come out of the blue. This is a different analysis from that found in the corrective feedback literature where researchers use the etic perspective and do not see correction practices as socially negotiated. They may view the reaction from the learner as important to the issue of whether an explanation is beneficial to acquisition, but in a CA perspective this reaction and also the role of the learner in the initiation of correction activities, as pointed out in Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler (2013), is fundamental to the categorization and recognition of the practice as such; the *sine qua non* of correction practices.

It has been pointed out that the identities of an L2 learner and an L2 expert in the wild

are made relevant in the interaction through category-bound activities. In terms of membership categorization, this becomes prominent in cases where, following trouble in the L2 speaker's turn, the L1 speaker takes the lead in instructing the L2 speaker on some linguistic matter related to the former trouble item, thereby engaging in a category-bound activity of a teacher and treating the L2 speaker as a learner. In these cases, the L1 speaker, or the 'teacher,' makes use of resources known from the classroom, such as elicitation of correct items, conjugations, pronunciation rules, case (dative/accusative) explanations. This makes the category-bound behavior stand out even more clearly.

Finally, I turn to pedagogical implications of the study. The main point of this study is that L2 correction practices in the wild are social undertakings where the contributions of both participants in an interaction constitute the practice. It is not only about the feedback from the L1/teacher but also, crucially, about how the L2 learner both initiates and treats it. In the correction activities we see success when the L2 learner understands and picks up the corrected items. In self-initiated repair environments this pick-up and understanding is publicly visible in the ensuing topical continuation in which the repaired item is used by the L2 speaker, and in other-initiated repair environments we often see the L1 speaking 'expert' acknowledging the pick-up by complimenting the L2 speaker. Irrespective of the initiator of the repair sequence, L2 teaching in the wild is said to take place when both participants visibly orient to the activity as such. This is particularly evident in the examples showing explanations (Excerpts 4–5) and other-initiated other-repair (Excerpt 6). I have already argued that this makes for a different view of correction and explanation practices than that found in the traditional feedback literature, where the primary focus is on one particular action. It is, however, an even more important insight in light of previous research showing that the majority of instances of corrective feedback practices in L2 classrooms are recasts (Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002) because these are functionally ambiguous; L2 learners often have a range of interpretational options when a teacher provides a recast. Viewing the correction practice as a collaborative enterprise, driven by the needs of the L2 speaker, instead of merely a teaching device can inform teachers' and learners' understanding of successful L2 learning/teaching practices in which both parties orient to the item(s) in question and the negotiation work runs off as a

joint attentional focus (Fasel Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the editors Ali Reza Majlesi and Søren Wind Eskildsen for all their help with the manuscript of this article and the three anonymous reviewers for their useful comments. I am responsible for any errors.

NOTES

¹ A reviewer made the point that Anna may be speaking to the recording device here and that the fact that she is recording herself may have had an impact on the nature of the talk more generally. It is impossible to say anything conclusively on that point, but I cannot see in the data presented here that Anna or her co-participant in any way is orienting to the presence of the recording device. Elsewhere in the data there are examples where Anna mentions the recording device explicitly, but they are very rare. It is of more consequence that Anna in some cases has social relationships with her conversational partners. This is a point that will be brought out in the analyses when relevant.

² Dispreferred response is a CA term denoting what actions typically follow other actions, for example 'invitation'—'acceptance.' A confirmation is the preferred response to a confirmation request and so the customer's response is mitigated by the turn-initial *uh*.

³ It is actually dative but the form and pronunciation of accusative and dative is the same, *bil*, which may account for this mistake.

REFERENCES

- Barraja-Rohan, A. (2015). 'I told you so': Storytelling development of Japanese learning English as a second language. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 271–304). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Brouwer, C. (2003). Word searches in NNS–NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534–545.
- Brouwer, C. (2004). Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Brouwer, C., Rasmussen, G., & Wagner, J. (2004). Embedded corrections in second language talk. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 75–92). London: Continuum.
- Ellis, N. C. (Ed.). (1994). *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*. London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339–368.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018a). 'We're learning a lot of new words': Encountering new L2 vocabulary outside of class. *Modern Language Journal*, 102, (Supplement 2018), 46–63.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018b). Learning behaviors in the wild: How people achieve L2 learning outside of class. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen–Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Markee, N. (2018). L2 talk as social accomplishment. In R. Alonso (Ed.), *Learning to speak in an L2*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Theodórsdóttir, G. (2017). Constructing L2 learning spaces: Ways to achieve learning inside and outside the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 143–164.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2015). Sprogbrugsbaseret læring i en tosproget hverdag: En forskningsoversigt over en sprogbrugsbaseret tilgang til andet-sprogsundervisning [Usage-based learning in everyday bilingual life: A review of the research in usage-based second language teaching]. *Nydanske Sprogstudier [Studies in Modern Danish]*, 48, 71–104.
- Fasel Lauzon, V., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Focus on form as a joint accomplishment: An attempt to bridge the gap between focus on form and conversation analytic research on SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 51, 323–351.
- Firth, A. (2009). Doing *not* being a foreign language learner: English as a *lingua franca* in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 47, 127–156.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185–237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, R., & J. Wagner (Eds.). (2004). *Second language conversations: Advances in applied linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Go, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35, 127–165.
- Greer, T. (2018). Noticing words in the wild. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, &

- A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.) *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S. W., Pekarek Doehler, S., Piirainen-Marsh, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294–338). New York: The Free Press.
- Jóhannesdóttir, Á. H. (2014). *Tungumálakennsla fyrir utan kennslustofuna* [Language teaching outside of the classroom]. Unpublished B.A. thesis. University of Iceland, Reykjavík.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). Conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117–142). London: Routledge.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35, 277–309.
- Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1083–1110.
- Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second language interaction*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions and other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98–116.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51–81.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1, 193–207.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491–500.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573–595.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–127). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2016). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*. Early online access (accessed 12 Sept. 2017): <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology* (pp. 325–345). Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129–158.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schumann, J. (1976). Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 26, 391–408.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14, 277–303.
- Theodórsdóttir, G. (2010). *Conversations in second language Icelandic: Language learning in real-life environments*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark.
- Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011a). Language learning activities in everyday situations: Insisting on TCU

- completion in second language talk. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as a social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*, (pp. 185–208). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011b). Second language interaction for business and learning. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 93–116). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Theodórsdóttir, G. (2018a). From an L2 learner to a participant in interaction: Evidence from the wild. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen–Marsh (Eds.) *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Theodórsdóttir, G. (2018b). Knowledge gaps as members. *Pragmatics and Society* (Special issue on Categorization in Multilingual storytelling).
- Theodórsdóttir, G., & Eskildsen, S. W. (2011). The use of English in everyday Icelandic as a second language: Establishing intersubjectivity and doing learning. *Nordand*, 6, 59–85.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on L2 learning* (pp. 75–104). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

↑	Shift to high pitch on next syllable
?	Rising intonation on previous syllable
,	Falling intonation to mid on previous syllable
.	Falling intonation to low on previous syllable
=	Latching
.hh	In-breath
hh	Aspiration (e.g., exhale, laughter token). The more ‘h’s the longer the aspiration.
[Top begin overlap
]	Top end overlap (
[Bottom begin overlap
]	Bottom end overlap
>word<	Faster than surrounding talk
<word>	Slower than surrounding talk
°word°	Softer than surrounding talk
word	Creaky voice
<u>word</u>	Emphasized talk
wo-	Cut-off
:(::)	Stretching of previous sound (the more colons, the longer the stretching)
(0.2)	Length of pauses in seconds
(.)	Micropause (less than 0.2 sec)
(word)	Uncertain transcription
(xx xx)	Unintelligible talk.
((word))	Transcriber’s comments
