UC Berkeley
L2 Journal

Title

Researching Vocabulary Development: A Conversation Analytic Approach

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4xk6t6x6

Journal

L2 Journal, 8(1)

Author

Reichert, Tetyana

Publication Date

2016

DOI

10.5070/L28128107

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Researching Vocabulary Development: A Conversation Analytic Approach

TETYANA REICHERT

University of Waterloo
E-mail: *tetyana.reichert@uwaterloo.ca*

This paper contributes to the much debated yet still largely unanswered question of how second language (L2) learning is anchored and configured in and through social interaction. Using a socio-interactional approach to second language (L2) learning (e.g., Hellermann, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010), I examine students' search for the meaning of a lexical item and subsequent use of the same item. This study is longitudinal in design and attempts to understand how participants orient to a lexical item as an object of learning to co-construct locally enacted and progressively more complex interactional repertoires in the target language. The data consists of recorded interactions between learners of German as they work on a project outside of the classroom for several days during a two-week period. The analysis involves tracking multiple episodes where a vocabulary item is used and attended to by the group of learners. Learners engage in learning practices and create opportunities for L2 learning through interaction, employing strategies such as timely peer assistance and appropriation of new conversational meanings.

INTRODUCTION

An increasing number of SLA researchers emphasise the need to carry out longitudinal investigations to uncover potentially critical aspects of group learning as grounded in the linguistic practices of social activities (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Mori & Markee, 2009; Ortega & Iberri-Shea, 2005). And yet, relatively few studies use longitudinal data to examine interactional practices during group work (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2009; Young & Miller, 2004). Drawing on a socio-interactional approach (also known as CA-for-SLA, Hellermann, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010), this study examines opportunities for learning German as a foreign language in learner-learner interactions that take place outside of class. The analysis involves two steps. First, I focus on moments when participants face problems overcoming an obstacle in L2 talk (i.e., a word search) and on the mechanisms they use to manage such situations. Secondly, I track and observe uses of the solution words throughout speech events during preparation sessions and presentations in class.

My argument is that word searches can trigger learning-related interactional practices at a later point in an activity, whereby language learning and language use can occur concurrently. In all stages of the analysis, I examine how the linguistic practices of engaging in searches for a word and again employing the same item later in conversation contribute to the learning of German.

ON LANGUAGE AND LEARING FROM A CA-FOR-SLA PERSPECTIVE

Initiated by Firth and Wagner (1997, 2007), the socio-interactionist approach to L2 learning provides important impulses for rethinking dominant conceptions of language and learning as a process of gaining possession of a commodity. While socio-interactionists see CA's strength in its analytical apparatus for documenting language development in micro-moments, they adopt exogenous theories as a guide for analyzing learning. Scholars (e.g., Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004), refer to the work of developmental psychology in the Vygotskyan tradition, aligning with in several regards insights from sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Within the socio-interactionist research tradition, the dynamic and situated dimensions of learning have been highlighted, whereby interactions represent a driving force of the learning process (Pekarek Doehler, 2010). The evidentiary value of speech perturbations and production errors provides proof of speech processing, not of deficient communication. From this perspective, learning goes hand in hand with socio-culturally and historically accomplished practical activities, such as discussing task organization, writing activities, and negotiating meaning and stances in an L2. In addition, van Lier (1996) points out that continuity is central to learning: "[Language] learning is the cumulative result of sustained effort and engagement over time" (p. 43). Consequently, instead of asking how linguistic knowledge gets internalised, socio-interactionists seek to understand the union of learning and social exchange that takes shape over time.

As Pekarek Doehler (2010) notes, the shift in the conception of learning occurred parallel to the reconceptualization of the notion of language. Language is no longer seen as an innate capacity of the mind but is understood as dialogic and adaptive to social change. This view on language calls into question the separation between language learning and use (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; van Lier, 1996). Language is viewed as an entity bound by context that speakers use and develop through socializing in various contexts. From this perspective, learning a language involves using it for emergent socio-interactional needs in accordance with speakers' interpretation of a given situation. Enacted as social and collaborative transformative practices, conceptions of both language and learning are determined by the conditions of the social interaction (e.g., having a fluid nature, see Pekarek Doehler, 2010; van Lier, 1996). The end results are dynamic, adaptive, and sensitive to the contingencies of use—"competences-in-action" (Pekarek Doehler, 2010, p. 107) and "proficiency-in-progress" (van Lier, 1996, p. 42) —that students reach through "learning-in-action" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 800) in situated practice. In the image of learning that emerges from linguistic practices in social interaction, the permanence of *having* gives way to the constant flux of *doing*.

STUDIES OF L2 DEVELOPMENT

The rethinking of established views on language and learning not only broadens possibilities for how scholars go about documenting learning but also increases awareness of the contextual dimension of observably enacted language use as linked to continuous adaptation of linguistic and semiotic resources. A few surveys conducted within a sociocultural framework trace the development of language use over time, helping us to understand the adaptive and dynamic character of linguistic knowledge. They provide empirical support for resulting linguistic and interactional competences as co-constructible and sensitive to

"contingencies of use" (Pekarek Doehler, 2010, p. 107).

Belz and Kinginger (2002) examined sociolinguistic use and the processes of learning V-forms of address (i.e., *Du/Sie* and *tu/vous*) in peer interactions. In their study, students at an educational institution in the United States interacted with peers from Germany and France through electronic social contact over a period of time. The researchers documented participants' great variability in learning indexical politeness at the beginning of the project, partly because of their strong tendency to use V-forms, encouraged by personal beliefs and motivations. While several students corrected their use of forms of address immediately after an interlocutor's explicit feedback, others took longer to arrive at an appropriate choice of address terms. Researchers observed that personal relationships and social exchanges afforded learners highly meaningful and timely peer-feedback, which instigated their linguistic development.

Another example of sociocultural longitudinal SLA research is Kobayashi's (2003) case study. The author conducted a survey examining collaboration among undergraduate students. Over five days Kobayashi traced the development of a group project by Japanese exchange students in their first semester studying abroad at a Canadian university. The participants in this study engaged in dynamic interactive work, whereby first language (L1), peer assistance, and negotiation of audience addressivity played an important role in achieving successful performance in class. Kobayashi reported that mastering activities successfully in the setting that he observed may have brought students to a better position from which to engage in subsequent similar activities. To ascertain whether the focal participants learned to interact through what Rogoff (1995) calls 'participatory appropriation' (p. 151), Kobayashi noted that longitudinal data would be necessary.

To analyze the discursive practice of revision talk by an adult learner as evidence of L2 learning, Young and Miller (2004) brought together two frameworks: CA and the theory of situated learning. Their analysis showed that the participation framework changed; the quantity and the quality of student talk increased over the course of the study. In addition, scholars observed that, although the focal student's participation improved, the instructor was responsible for coordinating the quantity of contributions from the student in an engaging way in order to support the learner's development of linguistic skills.

However, the interactional model in Young and Miller's (2004) study may be unique to the specific setting observed (van Lier, 1996). Classroom language use is quite different from language use when the instructor is not present. The differences between teacher talk and communication talk lie in their intention. Teacher talk is usually associated with ritual strategic performance with the authority to organize the classroom activities, as opposed to communication talk, which is strictly concerned with delivering a message. While findings on learning embodied in interaction during classroom talk are crucial, they do not speak to the important question of if and how students, when left alone, manage interactions and if such interactions facilitate peers' linguistic and interactional progress in a new language. The research on learning in non-classroom settings can add to our understanding of the interactional practices occasioned by small group work that are frequently used in classrooms.

These studies provide evidence of learning an additional language as a result of language use with other peers in multiple encounters over a period of time. More specifically, learning involves knowing forms of address as well as knowing how to use available forms of address with an interlocutor (Belz & Kinginger, 2002), successfully mastering interactive activities

(Kobayashi, 2003), and co-constructing progressively more complex student talk (Young & Miller, 2004). These previous findings support the main argument of the present study by showing how interactional development is tied to opportunities to engage in meaningful conversations with peers, consequently underscoring the continuous, dynamic, and interrelated nature of learning. Working together with other interlocutors, enacting, trying out, and redeploying a learning item at a later point in an activity can trigger learning-related interactional practices. In line with this research, the analysis of the present study probes deeper into the acquisition of foreign lexicon through its focus on micro-level accomplishments, closely examining how language learners develop an understanding of a German word.

WORD SEARCHES AS A SOURCE FOR LEARNING

The interactional practice of word searches has received increased attention within the field of CA-for-SLA. The conversation analytic research has provided important insights in the analysis of both non-classroom data (Brouwer, 2003; Egbert, Niebecker, & Rezzara, 2004; Kurhila, 2006; Markee, 2011) and classroom data (Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Park, 2007), helping us to understand the detailed unfolding of L2 interactional practices and learning. Word searches, which can entail searching for a lexical item, its meaning, and its grammatical category (e.g., a word ending), are a common practice in conversation and often become the central activity in multilingual settings (Park, 2007). However, research on word searches examined in L2 interactions shows that it is not always clear what the missing item is (Kurhila, 2006).

Word searches are categorized as forward-oriented repair and represent an obstacle in speaking, hearing, or understanding speech (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Embedded in longer sequences of talk, they are often observable practices that can be framed by vocal and non-vocal phenomena. Speakers frequently mark unfolding conversational difficulty with pauses, speech perturbations, cut-offs, sound stretches and vocalizations, such as *uh* and *uhm* and/or questions, such as *What do you call it?*, through gestural movements, gaze shifts, raised eyebrows, a pensive face (Schegloff, 1979), or by "doing oral avoidance" (Markee, 2011, p. 607). Interlocutors may recognize this call for assistance and attend to the search, which can involve proposing one or several candidate words to solve the search. The acceptance of a candidate word is often recognizable due to its repetition by both the speaker as well as the interlocutor. Finally, the production of acceptance tokens, such as *right* and *yeah*, and or head nods (Hosoda, 2006) follows the closure of a prototypical search.

As for L2 learning, a growing number of studies on word searches have informed CA-for-SLA research on L2 interactions. For instance, Brouwer (2003), Mori and Hasegawa (2009), and Reichert and Liebscher (2012) show that lexical acquisition emerges from the interactional practices of searching for words and is embodied in processes of both comprehension and social interchange.

Although studies on word searches in educational settings contributed greatly to the general understanding of lexical acquisition and L2 learning, research drawing on longitudinal findings could reveal what happens to solution words after the word search has been completed. Calling for more studies of longitudinal design, Ortega and Iberri-She (2005) point out that learning an additional language is a complex process that involves

maturational constraints for the development of L2 competences.

To trace the use of a solution word across multiple speech events, I draw on Markee's (2008, 2011) learning behavior tracking methodology, which examines both language learning behavior over time and participants' orientation to details of talk. I focus on one particular word search because participants themselves chose to focus on this search and to incorporate the solution word of this search in multiple episodes during different activities.

DATA AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS

This study is part of a larger project involving three German as a foreign language courses taught at a university located in a midsized city in the English-speaking part of Canada. Students from 23 groups agreed to participate in the project. The analytical focus of this paper is on interactions of one group consisting of three students: one man (here called Rob) and two women (here called Ann and Lee). The students were enrolled in their second semester of the beginner level course. All participants were in their mid-twenties and were of diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Ann and Lee reported Spanish and Rob reported English as their first language.

At the end of the course, students had to complete a project in the form of a speaking test. The speaking test took place in class and consisted of two parts, both conducted in the target language. For the first part, students presented a role-play on student life in Germany with one or two peers. In the second part, other students from the same course, along with the instructor, asked presenters spontaneous questions related to the presentation or to the material covered in the course. The preparation for the speaking test took place in group sessions outside of the classroom. In these meetings, students were observed composing and rehearsing the role-play, as well as brainstorming possible questions and formulating answers for the question and answer session.

The data for the analysis were drawn from video recordings of group interactions made during meetings outside of class and during speaking tests within a two-week period. In order to both capture the dynamics and provide a holistic view of behind-the-scenes processes of linguistic knowledge construction, a naturalistic data collection approach (Gass & Mackey, 2007) was used. I minimized my intrusion in the student activities so that they were as natural and unstaged as possible.

Additionally, the qualitative data consist of recorded spoken data (i.e., interviews) and written data (i.e., a questionnaire, field notes, and notes from class observations). All spoken data were transcribed and analyzed using conversation-analytical techniques. Pseudonyms were used in order to protect the anonymity of the participants.

ANALYSIS OF LEARNER CONVERSATION

Rob, Ann, and Lee met five times on different days to prepare for the speaking test. The preparation sessions included several stages, such as familiarization with the task instructions, division of labour among group members, selection of the topic for the skit, composition of the script, preparation of props (i.e., material objects and signs) for the performance, and fine-tuning of the role-play in German through numerous rehearsals. Students' use of the German false cognate *dick* was tracked throughout several group conversations that took place at the various stages of the task preparation. Five segments

(here called excerpts) were selected for detailed analysis and are presented in chronological sequence.

In Excerpt 1, students compose the scene: *On the first date in a restaurant*. Ann, acting as a waitress, takes an order from the student couple (Rob and Lee). Like the majority of the participants in this study, Ann, Rob, and Lee discussed the content of the role-play in English and then formulated German sentences while simultaneously taking notes on a laptop. The sequence of this excerpt begins when all three students are sitting at a desk. Rob starts typing the lines for Lee's character on his laptop, while Ann and Lee follow his writing on the monitor. The main business of the exchange in Excerpt 1 is the search for the English equivalent for the German adjective *dick*, translated as *thick* in English.

Excerpt 1[1]

1   Rob: look at this ((pointing at the monitor))
2   Ann: ((looks on the monitor)) what's **di[cke,**
3   Rob: [ha
4   Lee: FIne then it has to be somebody else
5   Rob: ((looks on the monitor)) eine grosse leckere **dicke** wurst ha
                                    (*a big tasty thick sausage*)
6   Lee: ((punches Rob's arm)) <<very quietly>don't read it hahaha>
7   Rob: ((smiles looking at Lee))
8   Ann: what's **dicke** ((shifts gaze from computer and looks at Rob and
              Lee))
9   what's **di**=what's=what is the second word there (1.0) what
              does it mean
10   Rob: tasty ha
11   Ann: really? (.) **dicke** means (.) tasty
12   Rob: NO **dicke** means thick
13   Lee: uh sí=sí=sí it was HAHA some(h)thing ( ) hahaha
                (*yes yes yes*)
14   Rob: ha
15   Ann: I thought it was something ELse
16   Lee: haha
17   Rob: ((pointing at the monitor)) that means thick [that means tasty
18   Lee: [hm (   ) mhm
19   Ann: OH THI:CK
20   Lee: mhm
21   Rob: yeah THICK
22   Ann: I thought you said <quite<di(h)ck= haha>>
23   Rob: NO(h) haha
24   Ann: which (is) [not good
25   Rob: [that's=that's THIck (.) and this
26   Lee: <quite<ha>>
27   Rob: and that (.) that's ta[sty and
28   Ann: [tasty
29   Rob: and that's big
30   Ann: [yeah I know
31   Rob: [so those two ( ) ha

32   Lee: [( ) ((Spanish)) ((nodding to Ann))
33   Ann: for this
34   Rob: hm. HA
35   Ann: <quite<don't do tha:::t> ha
36   Lee: haha
37   Rob: that's what you have to say ((to Lee))
38   Ann: that's what you ha(h)ve to say(h) lee(h)
39   Lee: hmhm
40   Ann: mhm
41   Lee: I AM NOT gonna say THAT

In line 2, Ann calls for clarification of the word in "what's dicke," which appears to be missing from her linguistic repertoire. Through her request, she positions her friends Rob and Lee as more knowledgeable learners of German. Rob and Lee orient toward Ann's call for help, with Lee interrupting the side-sequence (line 4). To scaffold Ann's understanding of the missing German word *dick*, Rob reads aloud "dick" in the context of the whole phrase ("eine grosse leckere dicke wurst") written in the script of the role-play (line 5). Yet Ann is unable to come up with the English equivalent for the German word.

Ann's interest in the meaning of the German adjective *dick* [thick] is not solely driven by her orientation to fill the knowledge gap. Lines 15, 22, and 24 provide evidence for Ann's concern about the inappropriateness of this word for the role-play. Ann's word search is triggered by her orientation toward the audience's expectations of publicly acceptable German, which involves appropriation and adjustment of role-play content to culturally given contents.

Ann repeats her call for a word search in lines 8 and 9. From her friends' exchange, accompanied by laughter and smiles in lines 6 and 7, she must have sensed that there was something intriguing about this word. Rob and Lee seem to share an inside joke with each other but not with Ann. Lee punches Rob, and her request that he not read the line aloud is followed by a laughter (line 6), to which Rob replies with a smile. Trying to get the joke, Ann signals the importance of the elicitation of the missing information by using the specification technique of repetition. She requests a search five times (lines 8-9). In response to Ann's question "what does it mean" (line 9), Rob provides a candidate word "tasty ha" (line 10), a wrong English equivalent. Despite Rob's position as a more knowledgeable expert in this talk, Ann does not accept Rob's potential solution word immediately. She requests a clarification in line 11, which also indicates her uncertainty about Rob's candidate in line 10.

Rob quickly catches his mistake in the next line with a self-repair "NO **dicke** means thick", which Lee confirms to be correct with the Spanish "sí=sí=sí" and a long laugh in line 13. Rob's stressed "NO" serves a twofold function. Besides marking the rejection the words said earlier, the negation particle simultaneously marks the follow up self-correction of his own knowledge. Thus, what starts as a word search initiated by Ann prompts Rob to reflect on his own linguistic knowledge.

In line 19, Ann produces a stressed "OH" and the repetition of the solution word "THI:CK", pronouncing it louder than the surrounding talk. This serves as an interactional mechanism to index her acknowledgement of Rob's candidate for the solution to her word search (cf. Schegloff, 2007; Schiffrin, 1987). The particle *oh* is

known to mark a speaker's strong emotional state (Schiffrin, 1987), and, according to Heritage (1998), it can indicate that the producer has undergone a change in her current state of knowledge (quoted in Schegloff, 2007, p. 118), namely, from non-knowing to now-knowing the German word *dick*. For Ann, the word search and assessment of the appropriateness of this candidate word provide her with possibilities to re-evaluate its English form and the German meaning, practices that create opportunities for learning this linguistic item together with Lee and Rob. Lee and Rob's participation is crucial for Ann's linguistic development because they organize the search in an intriguing and emotional way. By allowing us to experience the emotional aspects of language, such interactive work increases awareness of the form and the meaning (Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Nation, 2001), whereby emotions can mediate learning (Imai, 2010).

In summary, the negotiation of the correct candidate creates opportunities for learning (for Ann) and fine-tuning of knowledge (for Rob) of the target language, whereby disagreement is a technique that plays an important role in learning processes during this exchange. Furthermore, Ann's persistence in getting the joke and in finding out the justification for the use of a vulgar English word in the German role-play led to deeper engagement of the whole group. Such active participation in meaning negotiation makes the learning object more noticeable. However, Ann's learning is not complete after the word search, as demonstrated by the analysis of the next episode.

The following conversation occurs about eighty lines later in the transcript. Participants are no longer working on the scene *On the first date in a restaurant*; instead, Rob involves Ann in an off-task conversation, a type of exchange that has been frequently observed in this group. What is noticeable about this sequence is that it is a playful exchange conducted in the target language rather than in English, the language which all three participants admitted to being more comfortable with. As the excerpt begins, Rob smiles, remarking on something that he sees on the monitor.

Excerpt 2
 (2.0)
112   Rob: <smiling>hm> ((gestures for Ann to come to look at the monitor)) (2.0)
113   Ann: <smiling>sure>
114   Rob: haha
115   Ann: haha ((Rob and Ann establish mutual gaze)) **mei**=[haha=
116   Rob: [hahaha
117   Ann: **mei(h)ne wei(h)te dick(h)e hos(h)e** stupid words ever.
          (*my wide thick trousers*)

The relatively long pause of 2 seconds after the pointing gesture can be read as Rob's attempt to elicit Ann's reaction and, therefore, her engagement in humorous talk. With a smile and "sure" in line 113, Ann readily accepts Rob's invitation. Both delineate a common referent with help of gestures and emotional expressions (lines 113-114), a necessary step to enable intersubjectivity. Rob's laughter in line 114 functions as a discourse marker and is keyed by the speaker's expectation for a response, i.e., continuation of the talk. Ann's response in the next turn displays a critical aspect of her understanding of the ongoing action. She initiates a German phrase with "mei=" in line 115, possibly a truncated portion of the possessive adjective *meine* (*my*). Through a code-switch to German (same line), Ann establishes an authoritative stance, directing the

conversation toward the situated practice of *dick* in the German humorous talk to which Rob responds with overlapped laughter (line 116).

In terms of learning opportunities, Ann's cut off of "mei=" indicates that she may be considering modifying the utterance. Indeed, in her next turn (line 117), she re-launches the phrase started in the previous line, which results in the laughter-laden phrase "meine weite dicke hose". By producing an extended utterance, Ann establishes links to connect her knowledge of the solution word (Excerpt 1) to talk here. At the same time, she orients to the opportunity to learn to use the word within new and more complex interactional combinations. As this phrase occurs only once in the transcript and is not a part of the role-play script, this group activity also provides a unique learning opportunity to adopt the word in casual conversation among friends. In ethnomethodological terms, Ann's turn displays evidence of established intersubjectivity (Gardner & Wagner, 2004), using uptake from Excerpt 1 as a vehicle for further acquisition, namely, through context-specific connotations of *dick* along with its context of usage. In addition, this playful off-task talk illustrates participants' orientation to the learning practice, whereby laughter could function as a trigger for the interlocutor to re-orient to the unexpected, off-task use of German.

In the next situation, later the same day, Ann continues to explore meanings of *dick* in another conversation. This time, however, she uses the word to manage the rehearsal of the role-play.

Excerpt 3
184   Ann: und etwas ZU essen,
             (*and something to eat*)
185   Rob: ich will einen schnitzel mit brot
             (*I want a schnitzel with bread*)
186   Lee: und(h) ich(h) will ein große=I AM NOT say(h)ing that ha
             (*and I want a big*)
187   [whatever=whatever=whatever
188   Ann: [eine(h) **dicke** wurst
             (*a thick sausage*)
189   (.)
190   Ann: GENAU (pointing at Lee) ja(h) ha
             (*exactly*)
191   Lee: ha do(h)n't be retar[ded
192   Ann: [in einem augenblick
                                  (*in a moment*)
((all laugh))

During the rehearsal of the scene *On the first date in a restaurant*, in which the waitress (Ann) is taking an order from the student couple (Lee and Rob), Lee cuts off right before the German word *dick* occurs in the script (line 186). Through her remark "I AM NOT say(h)ing that" and the switch to English—the language shared by the group as a working language—Lee interrupts the rehearsal of the role-play and with it the practice of German. Ann takes initiative and acts as a prompter in finishing the part of Lee's words, "eine(h) **dicke** wurst". At the same time, she anticipates the forthcoming switch to German in a laughing fashion with no speech perturbations (line 188), moving

towards more fluent use of this newly learned word. Unlike in the previous two excerpts, here, she has no issues saying the German word *dick*. In line 190, through her pro-active initiative, Ann establishes her authoritative stance within this local context in a similar way as she did in Excerpt 2, namely, by marking the learning practice through her use of the target language. Ann coordinates the rehearsal, involving herself in the task-management, now rehearsing her character's words, and perhaps trying to engage Lee back into practice. Lee, however, does not accept the invitation, which she signals through her use of English along with the remark "ha do(h)n't be retarded". Despite Lee's second attempt to stop rehearsal, Ann continues practicing with a response from her character's words in line 192.

The most fundamental and critical point in this excerpt is that Ann incorporates the solution word into a new type of interaction and treats it as a learning item. Involving herself in task-management, Ann specifies the meaning of the German word *dick* by employing it for a new purpose (line 188). This time she situates *dick* in the management of the role-play rehearsal, i.e., engaging in the social activity of language learning. This demonstrates that Ann will now able to use the new word more effectively to participate in future activities. This episode also confirms the argument made earlier, namely, that the learning of a new language involves continuous adaptation of vocabulary, such as *dick*, as linguistic resource in response to locally emergent conversational needs (cf. Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Seedhouse, 2010). In this case, task management presents itself as the most pressing need.

Additionally*,* line 188 suggests that Ann seems to activate more than just interactional competence in multilingual encounters. Ann's choice of language sets the frame for the activity and is related to her insistence of rehearsing the role-play, but, at the same time, it charges the tenor of the discourse by playfully adding a sexual innuendo. She possibly tries to coerce Lee to say "eine(h) **dicke** wurst"*,* which references a sausage, a food that often stands in metaphorically for male genitalia. The playful elements of Ann's language use and her laughter in line 190 ("GENAU (pointing at Lee) ja(h) ha") are not limited to the linguistic form. Playing with the frame, she is playing with the pragmatic meaning at the level of understanding (cf. Warner, 2004). Thus, Ann seems to display an ability to play with two linguistic codes and to manipulate conventional categories. In other words, we observe her development of 'symbolic competence' through reframing (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008).

In the next situation, shortly after the rehearsal, Rob initiates a discussion with Lee and Ann. He provides authoritative knowledge about the vocabulary by appealing to the group's learning history in class in line 220, and then shifts his gaze toward Lee.

Excerpt 4
220   Rob: we learned all those words anyways (1.0)
((Rob looks at Lee))
221   Lee: yup
222   (1.0)
223   Rob: you know that
224   (2.0)
225   Ann: no
226   Rob: yeah b=

227   Ann: **dicke dicke**
228   Rob: yeah we learned [**dicke**
229   Ann: [NO
230   Rob: how much I [have=
231   Lee: [we DI:D we did
232   Rob: [how much i embed=how much
233   Lee: [we did
234   Ann: [WHEN?
235   Rob: [(i/we) embedded in **dicke**
236   Ann: it probably erased it from my (.) clean mind
237   Rob: but clean means thick
238   Ann: okay
239   Rob: ha

Rob's "looks at Lee" gaze shift may be interpreted as an initiation to participate in the talk (cf. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kurhila, 2006), to which Lee responds with a confirmative "yup" in line 221. Further, appealing to common knowledge through "you know that", Rob seeks confirmation from Ann. After a two-second thinking pause, Ann contradicts him with a "no" in line 225, giving her version of the learning history in class. This disagreement underscores for Rob the conditional relevance of his version. He responds with another contradiction, accomplished through English "yeah b=" (line 226), to which Ann responds with German "dicke dicke" (line 227). While Rob and Lee are not specific about vocabulary, Ann takes their responses as a challenge of her expertise, specifically in the word search for *dick*. The self-repetition serves for her as another sign of disagreement (cf. Excerpt 1) and may be interpreted as an attempt to camouflage her non-expertise through this justification.

At this point, Ann is directing the focus of the conversation away from the learning history in class and toward the learning history in the present activity. Ann's disagreements (lines 225 and 226) with Rob and Lee indicate that she takes her non-knowing in the word search to heart (cf. Excerpt 1), and the goal of her interactional work is to re-establish herself as a good learner. This extract shows the participants' own versions of their learning history becoming a part of the social conversation, with a focus on intersubjective work.

Ann effectively uses self-repetition of "dicke" to make her attempted reiteration of the collective learning history from class activities obvious to the group. In this case, the use of the word embedded in repetition transforms into a pragmatic function of repetition, a linguistic device to communicate her trouble recalling classroom events to the group. The use of *dick* as a pragmatic resource provides evidence that Ann's association between word and meaning grows stronger. Moreover, the lexical item is spread over a wider field of conversational meanings (cf. Vygotsky, 1934), namely, through its use for topic management, which results into a co-construction of more complex interactional repertoires in German.

Rob and Lee assert their authority of knowing and persist in being correct with their appeal to the learning history (lines 228-235), to which Ann responds with further disagreement in lines 229 and 234. Eventually, she steps back from her claim in line 238. By blaming her memory and decency for her forgetfulness, she also withdraws her claim for expertise in the learning history.

Thus, Ann's effort to re-establish herself as a good language learner involves interactional work such as negotiation of the learning history with Rob and Lee. The use of *dick* serves to display Ann's disagreement with her peers. The disagreement leads to the increased awareness, as well as emotional involvement of the participants, and, at the same time, mediates the development of an understanding of this word as an interactional resource, which can be seen as a part of learning.

The exchange in Excerpt 5 starts less than a minute after Excerpt 4 and will conclude the analysis. Here, similar to Excerpt 2, participants abandon talk about the group work in favor of practicing silly behavior. The excerpt begins with line 243, where Ann goes off-task by initiating teasing talk with *thick*.

Excerpt 5[1]
243 Ann: I would love (.) you gonna use that (.) THICK
244 Rob: yeah du bist **dicke** haha
                you are thick
245 Ann: i am thick? haha ((pinching Rob)) ha you are such a(h)
246 Rob: << pointing at his head> auf der kauf(h)> auf deinen kopf
                                 (in head   in your hea)d
247 Ann: yo(h)u too(h):::
248 Rob: yeah so:,
249 Ann: yeah
250 Rob: i accept it (.) yo(h)u ha de(h)ny on(h)e
251 Ann: who learn(h)ned this (deny) haha
252 Rob: haha ok(h)ay

In contrast to Excerpt 2, this time Rob catches on to Ann's tease and takes it as an invitation to contribute to the humorous situation with the sentence "du bist dicke,"[2] accompanied by laughter in line 244. The pronoun of address *du* shows that the sentence is addressed to Ann, provoking the interlocutor for a reaction.

In the next turn, Ann displays her orientation to the humorous encounter through laughter and a pinch but delivers a clarification request with a surprising "I am thick?", taking "du bist dicke" personally. By responding to German with the English clarification request, Ann draws the recipient's attention to the need to reestablish intersubjectivity. Rob says "auf deinen kopf" (on your head), a phrase that completes

---

[1] An anonymous reviewer suggested that in Excerpt 1 the male student tries to coerce the female student to say the line with the word *dick* by presenting this word in a way that borders on sexual harassment. The reviewer also suggested that in Excerpt 5 Rob enacts another power play. Rob's extended response indicates an attempt to backpedal the insult, whereby learning for him entails tricking his female classmates into awkward conversational moments. The video was scoured for evidence of sexual baiting on the part of Rob. However, no evidence to support this hypothesis was found. Hence, the written data give the impression of sexual baiting, but the video does not evidence such behavior. Since CA only allows researchers to make claims based on what the participants in an interaction observably orient to, this case might highlight limitations of CA.

[2] Rob uses a non-target-like form for the adjective functioning as object complement, "du bist dicke". In German, the correct form would be *du bist dick*. This turn provides evidence that the word has thus far been learned as a fixed form (i.e., *dicke*) and that the speakers do not yet adapt it morphologically in use.

his translation of the English idiom *someone having a thick head*[3] from line 244, which threatens the ongoing talk. The pointing gesture, the speech perturbation, and the self-repair in line 246 are markers of Rob's practice using German teasing talk in this interaction. The successful self-correction from hardly comprehensible "auf der kauf(h)" to comprehensible "auf deinen kopf" can be seen as the change in Rob's cognitive state, i.e., learning to integrate *dick* in his own speech in a more fluent fashion.

Learning for Rob involves incorporating the solution word into different types of interactions—much more than just uttering a teasing remark in German. By giving Ann the visual cue of what he is going to say, he ensures her comprehension of his phrase and, in this way, solicits her participation and reaction. Her response with a stretched "yo(h)u too(h):::" indicates that she takes the tease as a humorous exchange and responds by teasing him back. Rob's response "yeah so:, " signals the closure of the teasing talk. Although Ann does not speak any German in this exchange, her participation in this talk is crucial for Rob. She demonstrates her understanding of the ongoing joking talk. Through Ann's reaction (i.e., a request for clarification about whether the insulting phrase was indeed addressed to her), Rob gets a chance to reevaluate his own understanding of *dick*, a process that mediates Rob's learning of the pragmatic meaning of this word.

After the teasing talk, the students continue the humorous conversation (lines 248-251) in English, which can be understood as repair work to salvage their relationship and to reestablish intersubjectivity, as teasing talk may lead to a tense situation. In line 252, laughter and the "sequence-closing" "ok(h)ay" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 141) mark a happy ending for the excerpt. The interactional work in Excerpt 5 indicates learning opportunities that involve far more than just practicing saying the word *dick*. Both learners actively create opportunities for meaning negotiation while also learning from their interlocutor's reaction at moments where interpersonal relationships are of particular importance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study examined small group activities with a particular focus on students' interactions and their effect on learning. The analysis started with a word search and continued by tracking students' uses of the solution word in conversations over the course of two weeks. The longitudinal analysis of five excerpts demonstrated how participants incorporated the solution word into different types of interactions. It also showed how they treated the lexical term as a learning item to co-construct locally enacted and progressively more complex interactional repertoires in German.

The analysis of Excerpt 1 showed that learners do not instantly accept a word candidate from group peers. In addition to reaching an intersubjective understanding of what is searched for (cf. Kurhila, 2006), the participants negotiate potential solutions prior to completing the word search. In those particular moments, the participants reveal their emic orientation to expert versus non-expert roles as a means to assert their authority of knowing the correct candidate. Although learners position themselves and other peers as experts, the acceptance of the candidate from peers is built on some skepticism and doubt, in contrast to

---

[3] Rob's translation of the English idiom *someone having a thick head* is incorrect. The German equivalent of this idiom would be "dickköpfig sein" or "ein Dickkopf sein."

teacher-student interactions (This was observed in numerous word searches in other groups as well, cf. Reichert & Liebscher, 2012). Questioning a peer's candidate seems to be a prototypical feature of negotiation preceding the completion of the word search in L2 conversations between peers.

In the negotiation of a candidate item, acts of disagreement are of particular relevance. Participants orient to disagreeing as a means of engaging in interactive practices, such as meaning exploration of a candidate, assessment of its appropriateness for the class discourse, as well as confirmation with peers. For L2 acquisition, such interactive practices are found to be substantial in reuse of the word in new contexts. The analysis shows that learners create opportunities for expanding their communicative resources by reflecting on the sought-for-word, being mentally occupied with collaborative transformative practices, and noticing conditions that are relevant to the change from the candidate to the solution word.

The analyses of Excerpts 2 to 5 illustrate that participants utilize the solution word from the previously completed search. The solution word becomes a tool for participants' contributions to talks aimed at humorous exchange (Excerpt 2), task-management (Excerpt 3), negotiation of learning history (Excerpt 4), and teasing talk (Excerpt 5). Participants orient toward such interactions as legitimate practices in negotiating further conversational meanings of the solution word in the context of an utterance and in developing an understanding for the utterance from peer-addressees' reactions.

In Excerpt 3, through mimicking of a peer's words, the task accomplishment becomes the priority of the exchange. Participants of this study use the target language for task management instead of their working language, English, as other studies report (e.g., Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2005). The findings from Excerpt 3 suggest that the participants learn to navigate their way through the activity by the means of interactions with others, and this exchange entails mutually appropriating elements of each other's language use while simultaneously shaping the context of the exchange. Consequently, the development of the interactional competence and the development of symbolic competence appear to be interrelated processes in the context of this study.

In Excerpt 4, the interactional construction of oneself as a good language learner, by making connections between learning histories in the past (in class) and the present (in the word search, cf. Excerpt 1), creates specific opportunities for practicing the solution word. Excerpt 4 confirms that experiences from activities in the past can exert direct influence on the learning experiences in the present activity. Ann transforms the conversation frame from "those words" (line 220) into a specific formulation of the word *dick* that might have been the catalyst for her knowledge construction in this exchange. By pursuing the use of L2, the student actively creates possibilities for her learning to occur.

Excerpt 5 develops from the on-going activity into a conversation in which the main concern is not so much with the sense of what is said, as with its force. Making sense of what that utterance evokes for learners personally gives a unique experience important in acquiring pragmatic aspects of the word meaning. Here, the challenge of reconciling the developing word sense and meaning turns into an experience of the word as a union of thought and communication (cf. Vygotsky, 1978). Notably, in Excerpts 4 and 5, speakers are more oriented towards communication and intersubjectivity and less to the form of the lexical item. These segments provide a reasonable account of how participants establish and foster social relations that indicate ways in which participation and learning are accomplished.

The findings show learners developing understanding of the meanings of the German word *dick* as lived experience in the context of reciprocal support provided by peers. Here, group activity outside of the classroom provides space for the social accomplishment of interactional opportunities for learning German through what van Lier (1996) calls 'responsive teaching,' which may not be accessible through classroom discourse (p. 161). Remarkably, the participants of this study excluded the practiced lexical item in class during their oral presentation.[4]

Looking closely at the interplay between language, interaction, and learning in small group activities helps to define the practical application of these three elements when used in language courses. As evidenced by this study, group activities outside of class are of particular importance in facilitating learning opportunities that are unique in the sense that they permit true casual L2 acquisition, along with growth in linguistic knowledge and social development. As shown in Tarone and Swain (1995), students are reluctant to use the L2 with each other because they do not have an appropriate L2 vernacular for peer conversations. The group activities observed here provide off-task space where students can practice their L2 vernacular in spontaneous and naturalistic ways. Next, such activities allow learners to construct two-way conversations in the L2, in which each participant can decide how much he or she wants to contribute to the conversation, thereby giving learners a chance to develop confidence in their own voice. To avoid diglossia in L2 classrooms, a solution would be to organize activities outside of the classroom involving more contact with peers.

The present study exemplifies how CA-for-SLA can be applied to the analysis of word acquisition through interactions in the longitudinal development of an activity. The study of isolated micro-moments of word acquisition puts the process on the verbal plane and is uncharacteristic of communicative competence development (Vygotsky, 1934). As observed in this study, participants learn the meaning of a word as approached through another word (cf. Vygotsky, 1934) and in relation to the speaker's understanding of previously used utterances (cf. Bakhtin, 1981). The participants' orientation to learn German as a contextualized and socially distributed language developed into contiguous practices of learning subtle variations of meaning through negotiations in interaction. Such learning-related practices provide evidence that short exchanges are active parts of a learning chain and are constantly engaged during communication and understanding. It also shows that participants learn not in terms of what is the right thing to say in German, but more often through negotiation and collaboration. Correspondingly, learning in this activity is based on L2 processes in spontaneous speech, as opposed to subordinate uses of L2 classroom talk, where learners are guided towards the achievement of an academic goal as the priority of interaction.

The use of CA techniques for the contextual analysis of L2 acquisition was a productive way to examine gradual practices of L2 appropriation in longer stretches of talk. The findings yield more holistic in-depth insights of the multidimensional nature of lexical knowledge (cf. Seedhouse, 2010), which contributes to our understanding of what it means to learn a word in an L2. Previous studies have shown that conversational corrections threaten ongoing talk (Gardner & Wagner, 2004), but, as this study shows, corrections also offer a way of re-establishing intersubjectivity and negotiation of meanings, practices that are

---

[4] The omission of the lexical item in the subsequent performance might give support to the hypothesis about sexual innuendos.

important for L2 acquisition to occur. By focusing on interactional practices of word searches and the ways participants employ solution words in subsequent interactions, this paper adds to sociocultural understandings of language learning in small groups and calls for more longitudinal research within a conversation analytical framework.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

CA transcription conventions are based on German conventions (GAT), (Selting, Auer, Barden, Bergmann, Couper-Kuhlen, Günthner, Meier, Quasthoff, Schlobinski, Uhmann, 1998). The focus word is marked in **bold**. Incorrect use of German according to the German standard is not marked. English translations are provided in *italics* directly below corresponding German utterances. Uppercase CAPITALS indicate loud volume. Rising intonation (not necessarily for a question) is indicated with a question mark (?) and falling intonation is indicated with a period. Observer commentary is marked with ((double parentheses)), while conversational overlap is indicated with [square brackets], and unclear passages are marked with (single parentheses). A comma indicates low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation. Actions, including non-verbal actions, accompanying speech are marked with angle brackets: e.g., <<very quietly>don't read it hahaha>. Laughter tokens are indicated with 'ha'. Audible aspiration or laughter within a word is indicated by (h). Prolongation of a preceding sound is marked with a colon (:), e.g., co:lon. Interruptions or latched utterances are indicated with an equals sign (=). Pauses lasting a beat (.) are indicated as shown, while longer pauses are indicated in seconds, e.g., (2.0) indicates a two-second pause.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays.* M. Holquist (Ed.). (C. Emerson, & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(2), 189-214.

Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS: NS interaction: opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(4), 534-545.

Brouwer, C.E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*, 29–47.

Egbert, M., Niebecker, L., & Rezzara, S. (2004). Inside first and second language speakers' trouble in understanding. In J.W. Rod Gardner (Ed.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 178-200). New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 800-819.

Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (2004). *Second language conversations.* London: Continuum Ltd.

Gass, S.M., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M.H. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, 62*(1-2), 51-75.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning.* Clevedon, U.K: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: a case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 53*(2), 113-32.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27*, 291--334.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 25-50.

Imai, Y. (2010). Emotions in SLA: new insights from collaborative learning for an EFL classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(2), 278-292.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes, 59*(3), 337-369.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 645–671.

Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second language interaction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lantolf, J.P., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. Oxford: UP.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(ii), 234-247.

Markee, N. (2011). Doing, and justifying doing, avoidance. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 602-615.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: an introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 491-500.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(5), 501-518.

Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 65-94.

Mori, J., & Markee, N. (2009). Language learning, cognition, and interactional practices: an introduction. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 1-9.

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortega, L., & Iberri-Shea, G. (2005). Longitudinal research in second language acquisition: recent trends and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 26-45.

Park, I. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. *TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 1-23.

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. 105-126). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reichert, T., & Liebscher G. (2012). Positioning the expert: word searches, expertise, and learning opportunities in peer interaction. *Modern Language Journal, 96*(4), 595-605.

Schegloff, E.A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2010). A framework for conceptualising learning in applied linguistics. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 240-256). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barden, B., Bergmann, J., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Günthner, S., ... Uhmann, S. (1998). Gesprächsanalytisches transkriptionssystem (GAT). *Linguistische Berichte, 173,* 91-122.

Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*, 166–178.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: awareness, autonomy and authenticity.* London: Longman.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1930-1934/1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1934/2008). *Myshlenie i rech: osnovopolagaiushchie proisvedeniia. Klassika otechestvennoi psikhologii [Thought and language: main works. Classics of native land psychology].* Moskva: Khranitel.

Warner, C. N. (2004). It's just a game, right? Types of play in foreign language CMC. *Language Learning and Technology, 8*(2), 69-87.

Young, R.F., & Miller, E.R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 519-535.