Precluding and Abandoning Linguistic Repair in Dyadic Online Interactions for L2 Learning

William Owens*

Owens, William. (2022). Precluding and abandoning linguistic repair in dyadic online interactions for L2 learning. *English Teaching, 77*(1), 93-122.

This investigation uses conversation analysis (CA) to document, in very close detail, how participants-in-interaction manage and organize repair practices in moments when linguistic repair becomes conditionally relevant in conversational or 'chatting' phases of online dyadic L2-learning interactions between a tutor and tutee Specifically, this study focuses on the phenomena of precluding linguistic repair when it becomes relevant (by making it conditional on quick uptake and completion, and by deploying turn-taking devices to hold the turn when other-correction becomes or seems relevant) and abandoning it when it is in progress. Analysis framed these phenomena not as individual strategies, but as collaborative accomplishments realized through the interactional competence (IC) of the participants, and showed that participants oriented to both pedagogical and social concerns in moments of linguistic repair. Therefore, such moments were key sites for co-construction and configuration of the interactional space as primarily social or pedagogical, or as a complex and conditional interweaving of the two.

Key words: conversation analysis, conversation, online, repair, wordsearch, progressivity, fluency, interactional competence

*Author: William Owens, Student, Department of English Language Education, Seoul National University; 1, Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea; Email: wajowens@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Repair has long been a focus of research in second language acquisition (SLA) because repair–including, but not limited to negotiation of meaning–is considered a key site for the occurrence of second-language (L2) learning (e.g., Ellis, 1999; Kasper, 1985; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994, 1996). However, more recent research using conversation analysis (CA) to investigate SLA interactions (or CA-SLA, as it is commonly abbreviated) has shown that repair is also the site of complex social work, involving social constructs including identity (Hosoda, 2000; Ikeda, 2005; Kurhila, 2001, 2004, 2005; Park, 2007), participants' relative knowledge and epistemic access/authority (Hosoda, 2006; Kristiansan, Marstrand, & El Derbas, 2017), participant roles (Girgin & Brandt, 2020; Hauser, 2019; Jacknick, 2011; Kasper, 2004); and the nature of the interactional space itself (Majlesi, 2018; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015). Therefore, given that repair is a critical site for both 'doing pedagogy' and 'doing sociality', we might reasonably predict that, in an interaction (such as conversation-for-learning, or the chatting phase of a L2 lesson) in which both modes are conditionally relevant but there are no exogenous or institutional norms, the participants' organization of repair would be a good observational window into their relative orientations to pedagogical and social concerns.

The orientations that interactants display in these moments are of interest in terms of how they construct the interactional space, but also of interest are the specific practices that they deploy for doing so: if it can be empirically demonstrated that participants' repair practices in these moments are highly complex and nuanced, they can be called a realization of context-specific IC, and from this it can be inferred that the contingencies of the context provide an environment that drives IC development. Given that IC development is a form of L2 learning (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018), this would mean that, instead of considering these moments of repair in terms of participants 'choosing' between maintaining the progressivity of a conversation and stopping it in order to teach/learn the L2 (i.e., framing the issue as a problem or dilemma), there is a case for saying that the very act of orienting to and managing these apparently-conflicting concerns using the L2 is, per se, a form of L2 learning. [1]

---

[1] In keeping with CA methodology, the research was not initially guided by any particular focus, hypothesis, or research question(s). Instead, the focal phenomena emerged through 'unmotivated looking' at the data (see Section 3.2). As such, the rationale for the study presented here was written *after* the research was done. It is deliberately not presented in the traditional format of research questions in order to avoid the false and undesirable implication that the research was guided by research questions.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Repair in Conversation

Repair is omnirelevant in conversation, which is to say that any utterance by one speaker can then be targeted by an interlocutor for repair. This is generally done in the following turn (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), although this rule does not always apply in interactions for L2 learning (Wong, 2000). In effect, we can say that any and every utterance by a speaker generates a post-utterance opportunity or moment in which repair may (or may not) be initiated by the receiver. Both speaker and receiver generally orient to this fact; receivers often fill that moment with a continuer, such as 'uh-huh' or a nod of the head, to display their understanding of the state of the talk by publicly marking the moment and their passing-up of the opportunity to launch repair (Schegloff, 1982). Speakers, meanwhile, often orient to the same moments by leaving gaps in their speech and/or directing "extended gaze" toward their interlocutor (Schegloff, 1982, p. 79) as a means of facilitating and soliciting those continuers (or repair). Thus 'not doing repair' is itself an ongoing and collaborative process, relying on displays by all participants of understanding of the state of the talk, orientations to the (omni)relevance of repair, and regular checks and confirmations of understanding.

Other-initiated repair often targets a (suspected) problem with hearing or parsing what a speaker has said, as in the literal meaning of the canonical repair-initiation "what did you say?"; but it can also address perceived trouble or discrepancies in such social domains as knowledge/truth, participants' access to certain knowledge or domains of knowledge, emotional/affective stance, or the plausibility, appropriateness, relevance, etc. of what has been said (e.g., Lilja, 2014; Robinson, 2013). An important feature of other-initiated repair is that repair-initiating turns vary in their degree of specification of both the *source* of the trouble and the *nature* of the trouble (Schegloff et al., 1977). Consider the degree of specificity of the trouble *source* in the following responses to "the dog ate my homework":

1. "the dog ate your homework?"
2. "the dog ate what?"
3. "the dog did what?"
4. "what?"

Consider also the degree of specificity of the *nature* of the trouble in the following responses to the same sentence:

5. "do you expect me to believe that?" (the trouble is plausibility)
6. "I don't think dogs eat paper." (the trouble is either plausibility or the repair-initiator's knowledge of what dogs eat)
7. "the dog ate your homework?" (the trouble could be almost anything, including

plausibility, knowledge, or hearing)

8. "what?" (the trouble could be any of the above, or, for example, more serious trouble with hearing or parsing)

The nature of the trouble that a repair-initiation targets is constructed interaction-internally by the participants (Robinson, 2013); thus, a repair-initiation that does not specify the nature of the trouble it addresses is subject to having its nature constructed *post hoc* by the trouble-source speaker's response to it. For example, number 6 could be responded to with "honestly, it did", which would construct the repair-initiation as addressing plausibility, or with "they do when they're very hungry", which would construct it as addressing knowledge.

Self-initiated repair, on the other hand, tends to either correct a 'slip' or perceived mistake in a prior utterance, or to deal with trouble in finding, recalling, or otherwise producing a word or phrase, generally resulting in a wordsearch (Goodwin, 1983; Lerner, 1987). Such wordsearches can be completed either by the speaker themselves (on recalling or otherwise gaining access to a suitable solution), or by an interlocutor who constructs the trouble and wordsearch as a call for them to join in the repair and provide a "candidate solution", which is then either accepted or rejected by the speaker (Lerner, 1987).

2.2. Repair in Interactions for L2-learning

Interactions for L2-learning typically involve participants with asymmetry in their target-language expertise and have as an interactional goal the learning of the target language by one or more of the participants. These factors affect repair practices: metalinguistic repair of L2 learners' target-language usage is omnirelevant, although generally not initiated by the participant in the language-expert role (Kasper, 2004). Rather, L2 learners tend to initiate repair of their own utterances, in the form of self-corrections and wordsearches, or by soliciting confirmations from their interlocutors (Kasper, 2004; Koshik & Seo, 2012). Solicitations of confirmation are not exclusive to interactions for L2 learning; they are common in native-speaker conversations (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979) and in lingua franca interactions not aimed at L2 learning (e.g., Eskildsen, 2019; Svennevig, 2018). These most commonly take the form of a rising or questioning tone on the word or phrase in question, marking it as a potential source of trouble and soliciting a continuer from the interlocutor.

Research by Hosoda (2006), Koshik and Seo (2012), and Lilja (2014) has scrutinized these practices in interactions for L2 learning. Lilja (2014) found that repair-initiating repeats of an interlocutor's talk (which specify the *source* but not the *nature* of the trouble, thus leaving it to the speaker of the trouble source to divine and respond to the nature of the trouble) were treated as addressing hearing or understanding problems when the repair was

initiated by the learner-participant addressing the expert-participant's talk, but as a "challenge to the acceptability or plausibility of the repeated talk" when deployed by the expert-participant addressing the learner-participant's talk. (Lilja, 2014, p.101-102). This indicates orientation to language expertise asymmetry by the participants whenever repair was initiated. Hosoda (2006) similarly concluded that rising-tone solicitations of confirmation by learner-participants were constructed by the participants as orienting to and making interactionally relevant their language-learner identity–'doing being' a language learner.

Language-learner identity is not mutually exclusive with the construction of a participant-in-interaction as being "interactionally competent" (Hauser, 2017, p. 235) to participate in a conversation, but as Hauser (2017) explains, there exists a persistent conceptual tie between notions of 'performance' and 'competence' that associates the need to engage in linguistic repair with lower competence. 'Doing language learning' is also incompatible with the fluidity and progressivity that characterize successful conversations between highly-competent speakers. Invocation of language-learner identity resulting from repair practices is, then, perhaps one reason why Seedhouse (2004) notes that repair practices differ even within L2-learning interactions, with more direct (meta)linguistic repair taking place in form-focused interactions than in fluency-and-meaning focused interactions (which more closely resemble 'natural' conversations).

Koshik and Seo (2012) describe a specific type of ambiguity in repair practices in interactions for L2 learning that appears to reflect this dichotomy: they observed that learner-participants' rising-tone solicitations of confirmation were treated by the expert-participants sometimes as soliciting confirmation of understanding, and sometimes as soliciting confirmation of "some other aspect" of the marked utterance, for example linguistic accuracy. They also noted that expert-participants sometimes treated stalled wordsearches initiated by the learner-participants as a call for repair, and sometimes did not.

If we consider that language expertise asymmetry, and thereby language-learner identity, is omnirelevant and easily-invoked by repair, it is feasible that the difference between doing repair and not doing repair often boils down to the difference between invoking language-learner identity and not invoking it, and by extension, the difference between constructing the learner-participant as interactionally competent to participate in the conversation, or the opposite. Furthermore, as Hauser (2017) points out, not doing repair means prioritizing the progressivity of the interaction, whereas prioritizing repair means stalling it (Stivers & Robinson, 2006); thus, if progressivity of the interaction is loosely equated with successful performance and fluency, the conceptual link between repair and an identity of L2 incompetence is further strengthened.

It is important to point out that this distinction is theoretical; in reality, the realization of

linguistic repair is more nuanced than a distinction between simply doing it and not doing it; it can be partially done, for example, or done with no apparent orientation to L2 pedagogy at all but a fully social orientation, as it is done between native speakers; or it can be done with full and explicit orientations to L2 pedagogy (Macbeth, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). Furthermore, social and pedagogical orientations themselves are not necessarily dichotomous; participants do not have to 'choose' one or the other in any given moment. Orientations are dynamic and multi-faceted; indeed, definitions of what constitutes a 'L2 classroom' and 'not a L2 classroom' in the CA-SLA literature rely entirely on participants' orientations rather than physical locations or institutional contexts, whether in ostensibly pedagogical situations such as foreign language lessons (e.g., Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004) or situations that are not intrinsically pedagogical, such as service encounters (e.g., Eskildsen, 2019; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2018; Wagner, 2015). Participants can 'do' L2 classroom interaction one moment, and switch seamlessly to doing social interaction in the next (Kasper, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). CA-SLA research has also shown that participants in L2-learning interactions often simultaneously orient to both pedagogical and social concerns in moments when both become relevant (e.g., Lo, 2020; Van Lier, 2014; Waring, 2014), what Lo (2020) calls "wearing two hats". In this study, as with the others mentioned here, the goal is not to demonstrate *that* the participants exhibit both pedagogical and social orientations, but *how* they do so.

   With regard to the context of L2-learning interactions in CA-SLA research, a common focus is conversation-for-learning (Belhiah, 2012; Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Kim, 2015; Kim, 2017, 2019; Park, 2007), which bears a general resemblance to the interactions that make up the data for this investigation in that there is only a vague exogenous institutional imperative to 'do L2 learning', and how this is done is largely left up to the participants. This said, previous research has hitherto tended to restrict itself to face-to-face contexts. Some CA Research focusing specifically on online L2 learning interaction exists, though mainly investigating peer-peer interaction without a tutor present (Balaman & Sert, 2017a, 2017b; Balaman, 2019; Pekarek Doehler & Balaman, 2021; Sert & Balaman, 2018). Online dyadic L2 learning interactions involving a tutor remain only minimally touched-upon: Balaman (2021) presents an analysis of how consecutive repair sequences are used as a resource for completing writing tutorials online, but there are no extant CA studies specifically focusing on conversation-driven L2-learning interactions online. This is despite the recent crescendo in popularity of platforms facilitating such interactions, such as italki and Verbling. One of the aims of this study is to begin to repair this disparity between the direction of modern CA-SLA research and the direction of modern trends in L2 learning.

3. METHODS

3.1. Participants and Setting

The classes that constitute the data for this analysis were conducted between W, in the tutor role, and G, in the student role. Further participant and contextual information is intentionally omitted in alignment with the demands of the CA method: CA intentionally takes a radically interaction-internal perspective (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Kunitz & Markee, 2016; Seedhouse, 2005), and so any interaction-external information, i.e., information that the participants themselves do not demonstrably make relevant through their interaction, is considered a potential pollutant to the analysis (see Bushnell, 2009, for an in-depth exemplification of how this can happen with native speaker and non-native speaker categories); furthermore, given that CA does not attempt to generalize its findings, there is no apparent relevance for such participant information.

Regarding the context of the classes, G's employer engaged W to conduct a series of one-to-one L2-learning sessions with G and five other participants, with freedom to use any method or approach, and without any predetermined externally-imposed learning outcomes or assessments, beyond the general imperative to practice and learn English. Twenty-five classes were conducted between William and Garnet over six months, using videoconferencing software, although live video was never used, which is to say that the participants never saw one another; instead, the video feed was a shared screen that could be annotated by both participants, often used to share pedagogical tools such as worksheets and coursebook pages, but often left blank and used as a whiteboard. The shared video and audio feeds were recorded on W's computer.

3.2. Method of Analysis

Of the six learner participants, G's classes, comprising a total of around 25 hours of data, were selected at random for closer analysis. The analysis presented here forms part of a larger project analyzing the ways in which W and G organize the interaction of their classes. Their classes tended to be composed of distinct pre-task "chatting" and on-task "studying" phases, with the "chatting" phases closely resembling normal conversation, or at times conversation-for-learning (Kasper & Kim, 2015), in terms of their repair practices and orientations to the participants' relative English expertises. It is those "chatting" phases that are the object of analysis here.

Conversation analysis (e.g., Psathas, 1995; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007) was employed to access and make observable the granular details of the interaction. The data was first transcribed in a traditional fashion, following which a period

of 'unmotivated looking' generated a focus on the ways in which the participants organized the interaction, and how this changed over time. Key events were identified and transcribed in finer detail, using the conversation analysis transcription system (Jefferson, 2004), and closer analysis of these events revealed abandoning/precluding of linguistic repair as one of many specific phenomena significant to the overarching theme.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Preference for "Go-ahead" Responses to Rising-tone Confirmation-solicitations

Extract 1 comes from G and W's 14th lesson, and Extract 2 from their 18th. In Extract 1, G uses prosody to index uncertainty regarding the phrase "operation systems" (line 14). In Extract 2, she does the same with "penentrate" (line 42). In both cases, W responds with a token of confirmation, even though the candidate word or phrase is objectively eligible for linguistic correction.

Extract 1: "Operation Systems" (Lesson 14)
```
12 G:    they have to work- work out the sof- works out softwares
13       that can actually:, (1.2) let's say a- adapt to,
14    →  differen:t (.6) o(.)peration sys↑tems?
15    →  (.)
16 W: →  ↓°mhm°.
17       (.6)
18 G:    >i mean<, they a:re people out #there#. (.5) using
19       (.) #ma:cs.#=
```

Extract 2: "Penentrate" (Lesson 18)
```
40 G:    H: .hhhh ↑yeah cos i've tried that before and ↑>y'know
41       sometimes< the blood. can be like w- what's the word
42       (.) <penentra:te>?
43       (1.4)
44    →  through_ (.) the mea:t::?=
45 W: →  =m::.=
```

```
46 G: →  =a::nd,
47        (.6)
48 W:     °↓m:.°=
49 G:     =it tastes really:, (.8) disgusting. if,(.)
```

In Extracts 1 and 2, her rising intonations do not specify what kind of feedback she is seeking, whether confirmation of understanding, or of some other aspect (e.g., accuracy), and so W's response could be hearable as orienting to either possibility (Koshik & Seo, 2012). G does not seek to resolve this inherent ambiguity, however, instead treating W's confirmations as go-ahead signals to continue her telling, suggesting an orientation to prioritization of the progressivity of the telling over concerns around linguistic accuracy. This is also reflected in the minimal and non-lexical nature of W's confirmation tokens, seemingly designed to cause minimum interruption to G's telling–indeed in Extract 2 he does not respond at all until G pursues a response from him by adding an increment to her initial saying, with further questioning intonation (Schegloff, 2000).

Extract 3: "Aerobics" (Lesson 10)

```
58 G:     .hhh (.8) u:m, (.) ↑no::. (.5) especially if you want to
59 →      do so:me,(.) aer:↑r/ɔ:/bi-(.)cs::? °↓is that a wor:d_°=
60 W: →   =>↑aer/əʊ/bics yeah.<
61 →      (1.6)
62 G: →   yeah. (1.0) i- it can't ↓well, y- you can only jog on
63        that, (.) °you can not do other things.° (.4) but- (.5)
64        we::_ (.3) do have (1.0) °some° applications that you
65        can download (.) to your pho:ne, an:d (.) they will be:,
66        like videos >that you can< follow the ac°tions (.) to do
67        th- (.) aer/əʊ/bics:,=
68 W:     =yeah that's cool, (.4) is that is that
```

In Extract 3, G's prosodic marking of uncertainty is followed by a direct question, "is that a word?" (line 59). This differs from Extracts 1 and 2 because it specifically solicits confirmation of a specific aspect of her phrasing, rather than allowing for the possibility of providing a simple confirmation of understanding. Whereas W's responses in Extracts 1 and 2 took advantage of the option to treat G's turn as soliciting confirmation of understanding, and thus kept his responses minimal despite the presence of correctable

linguistic elements, here his response is to provide a model pronunciation, an 'embedded' correction (Jefferson, 1987), in the form of a repetition of G's candidate phrase, paired with "yeah" (line 60). In this way, he responds to her specific solicitation for feedback regarding accuracy and provides the necessary repair, whilst still providing a preferred response (Pomerantz, 1984a; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2012) in the form of confirmation, green-lighting G's continuation and allowing the interaction to continue undiverted. It is noteworthy that this strategy succeeds on both fronts, as G immediately continues her telling but displays uptake of the correction as seen in her target-like usage seven lines later (line 67).

4.2. Abandoning/Precluding Repair

As shown in the three extracts above, the repair sequence passes quickly and without trouble when W provides solicited confirmation promptly, and there is an observable trend for W's responses to favor this over explicit metalinguistic repair, even when the form of G's phrasing is eligible for such repair; this demonstrates W's orientation to a prioritization of progressivity over repair. The following extracts will show how both participants further orient to this prioritization, and co-construct it as shared, by cooperatively abandoning recently-initiated repair before its completion when it appears to threaten progressivity.

4.2.1. The threshold for a response

Extract 4: "Hopping" (Lesson 18)
```
78 W:    m[    :    :    :    .   ]
79 G:    ↑[<y'know with (.) do:gs], they always: li:k:e, (.) wa-
80       (.) not walking but (.) ↑>i don't know< the word=#like#
81       ↑hopping?
82       (.5)
83       ↑around you::?
84       (.3)
85 W: →  yeah,=
86 G: →  =>a-a-and [you know m-< maybe   H: ] maybe drag you:,
87 W: →            [ b o u n d i n g. °yeh.°]
88 G:    like (.) want you to take him or her outsi:de,
89       (.8)
```

```
90 W:    ye:[ah],
91 G:       [an]:d,
```

   G encounters trouble in the form of dissatisfaction with "walking" as a description of the behavior she doesn't like in dogs, but she does not have a preferable alternative immediately available. This is manifest in her cutting-short the word "walking" during the first syllable (line 79) and then deploying "not walking, but…" as a means of making public her search for a better word than "walking" to express the dog-behavior she has in mind. Instead of engaging in an extended wordsearch to find a suitable term, however, she quickly provides "hopping" (line 81), which she marks as possibly inadequate to by prefacing it with "I don't know the word", and "like" (line 80), and again prosodically marking it to solicit confirmation from W.

   As in Extract 2, W's response is not immediately forthcoming, and G pursues it with an increment of her original saying ("around you?"–line 83). W provides the solicited confirmation ("yeah"–line 85), and G immediately resumes her telling (line 86). Crucially, however, given the brief delay caused by the internet connection and the lack of any communication channel other than audio, G's resumption in line 86 is too quick to have been a response to W's confirmation in line 85 [2] (the transcription is based on audio recorded on W's computer, meaning that there is no delay on his voice, but a very short delay on G's). Instead, her continuation appears to address the fact that he has not responded to her solicitations in lines 81 and 83; her continuation is a response to the passing of some 'window of opportunity' in which he might provide the confirmation. It can be concluded from this that the continuation of her telling was not conditional upon the successful completion of the repair (whether of intersubjectivity or some other aspect) relating to "hopping". This is not to say that this example does not follow Koshik and Seo's description (2012) of what rising-tone candidate phrases solicit; indeed, W treats the rising-tone exactly as Koshik and Seo's discussion (2012) predicts. Rather, it suggests a threshold [3] within which the repair–whatever its target–must be completed before G abandons it and moves on.

---

[2] Note that in Excerpt 2, the length of W's "mm" in line 45 makes it feasible that G's resumption was a response to hearing W's confirmation, therefore that excerpt can not be classified as an example of abandoning repair.

[3] There is no way of observing what resource(s) the 'threshold' applies to: it may be a simple issue of time from repair initiation to completion, but it may equally be a complex construct involving multiple factors, including subjective and unobservable ones (for example, cognitive load, or perceptions of loss of progressivity). It is for this reason that I avoid discussing the threshold in terms of time, and instead necessarily leave it as an undefined point on an undefined scale, measuring some unnamed and unknown factor or combination of factors. I aim only to establish the threshold's existence and effect on the interaction, not to operationalize it.

Extract 5: "Which Preposition?" (Lesson 19)

```
 93  G:    i ha:d, (.) yeah i had to catch a flight to ((omitted))
 94        u:m, at (.4) well a- (.) °at (.) Friday night
 95        (.)
 96        on >Friday night< uh
 97        (.)
 98        which,
 99        (.8)
100        ↓preposition.
101        (.)
102        should i use.
103        (.3)
104        at Friday night?°
105        (.)
106 W: →  on:.=
107 G: →  =okay. (.3) ↑a:nyway, (.) in the e-
108    →  (.3)
109    →  ↓on. °okay on: Friday night°
110    →  (.4)
111    →  SO:, uh YEAH i have to:, (.4) um, flew to:, (.3)
112       ((omitted)) an:d, (.) then:, s:tay there fo:r (.)
113       a night,  (.) and then catch a- an early plane
```

Extract 5 presents another sequence of repeated pursuit of a response by G, again ending in a move to abandon the repair sequence and continue with her telling when no response appears to be forthcoming from W. She encounters trouble choosing between "at" and "on" (lines 94-96), trying both, and then appealing to W for repair of the uncertainty, initially using "which" (line 98). Beginning at this point she asks the question "which preposition should I use? At Friday night?", but the utterance is broken into four parts, each followed by a pause. This appears to be done by design, rather than disfluency: "preposition" (line 100) and "should I use?" (line 102) both end in falling intonation, presenting them as a possible end of G's turn-constructional unit (TCU) and therefore as a place where W might begin a response TCU (Ford & Thompson, 1996). This presents numerous opportunities for W to provide the solicited repair, but by line 104 he still has

not done so. At this point G pursues it further by providing a suggestion, "at Friday night?", scaffolding W's response by making a simple confirmation (or rejection) an available (indeed, preferred) response option (Heritage, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984b).

At this point, W provides "on" (line 106), almost at exactly the same time as G begins her next turn, "okay, anyway, in the e-" (line 107). G's turn in line 107 is clearly a move to abandon the project to repair her uncertainty surrounding "at Friday night" and move on with her telling, substituting the troublesome phrase with, presumably, "in the evening", about which she exhibits no uncertainty. This interpretation is ratified by Park's (2010) analysis of "anyway" in conversation as "a sequence-closing device to put an end to […] interactional trouble" (p. 3283) which "projects a rather premature ending to move past a stalled sequence" (p. 3291)–W's continued non-response here certainly constitutes grounds for G to treat the sequence as "stalled". The fact that G deployed this "anyway-and-move-on" device *before* receiving W's response ("on"–line 106) is demonstrated by her later interrupting her move-on TCU (line 107) to respond to W's "on" (line 109), attesting that she received W's "on" significantly later than the point in the transcript where he produced it. Given that G's "anyway-and-move-on" device ("Okay. Anyway, in the e-"–line 107) was clearly deployed *before* her receiving "on", it must be analyzed as an initiation of an abandoning of the repair sequence, in response to the threshold for a response from W having been passed. It is notable, however, that the initiation of the abandoning does not appear to close the window of opportunity for repair altogether: the delayed repair from W results in G abandoning her abandoning-sequence and returning to uptake the repair.

4.2.2. Abandoning/precluding (anticipated) other-repair

On other occasions, G appeared to orient to the relevance of upcoming linguistic other-repair from W, by using a variety of strategies to preclude or abandon it.

Extract 6: "Much less expensive" (Lesson 15)
```
62 W:    ↓but korea doesn't (.) sell [thos:e. ch °h    h    h° ]
63 G:                                [and it's (.) much- much ex-
                                     ˩
64       (1.1)
65       well it's less expensive, (.) well much: (.) less:. much
66     → ↑↑°uhh, much less expensive, (.) is that correct_°=
67     → =[.hhhhh     ↓U M:,          .hh  well-  ]
68 W:  → =[↑>much less ex<pensive yeah. (.) ↓or much] cheaper.
69       (.5)
```

```
70 G:    yeah mu- (.5) °yeah much cheaper° than thee: e- (.)
71       °the° regular air °conditioner.°
```

Lines 63-65 show G having trouble in formulating the phrase "much less expensive", observable in numerous pauses, false starts, and "well"-marked self-repair initiations; she she brings her uncertainty to the publicly-ratified surface of the interaction when she asks "is that correct?" following her final formulation of it (line 66).

The two participants' following treatments of "is that correct?" differ significantly. W treats it as a question addressed to him, and an initiation of other-repair, by immediately providing a response in the form of confirmation of the "correctness" of the phrase, along with an alternative in the form of "much cheaper" (line 68). G, on the other hand, doesn't treat her own "is that correct?" as a passing of the turn to W; instead, she immediately follows it with a loud inbreath and a loud, lengthened "um", followed by another audible inbreath and "well" (line 67), all of which signal intention to continue talking at a site of potential transfer of speakership (Schegloff, 1982, p. 81). Schegloff (1996) describes both "um" and inbreaths as *pre-beginnings*, that is, "elements which project the onset of talk, or the beginning of a (next) [TCU] or a turn, but are not yet proper recognizable beginnings" (p. 92). By projecting the onset of (continued) talk, G's inbreath and loud "um" in line 67 display her orientation to the possibility that her prior utterance ("less expensive? Is that correct?"–line 66) may be hearable to W as passing speakership to him, whilst simultaneously precluding such a transfer: In fact, she uses notably louder volume than normal for the "um," in accordance with Levinson's (1983) description of how participants-in-interaction prosodically "upgrade" their speech to make it more "turn-competitive" when they perceive an incoming interruption.

The difference in the two participants' treatments of "is that correct?" (line 66) comes from the question of whether it is designedly addressed to W; W's response treats it as being addressed to him, whereas G's move to retain the turn following the completion of the question constitutes a treatment of the question as *not* being addressed to W. This treatment is also hearable in the question's prosody, as it starts (at the beginning of line 66) with a sharp rise in pitch and drop in volume, marking it as private speech, perhaps to serve as a public signal of her awareness of the fact that the formulation may be problematic, but not to solicit repair from W (see Hauser, 2015, for a discussion of private speech as social action in L2 learning). She returns from self-talk (high and quiet) prosody to normal pitch for "um" and "well", projecting an end to her private speech and return to interlocutor-addressed speech. As such, her talk in line 67 is hearable as a move to abandon an unintentionally-initiated repair sequence before W ratifies it by providing the repair. Again, as in the previous extract, W's interjection providing the repair is swift and the repair is

subsequently uptaken (line 70) before the interaction moves on.

Extract 7: "Healthier" (Lesson 10)

```
00 G:   [() you feel,-] (.8) ↑you feel like you- (.)
01      you- you- .h you've been (.) healthier. (.) ↓than
02      before. #well healthier.# ↑SLIghtly ↓#healthier#.=
03 W:    =h↑yeah.
04       (.8)
05 G:   i don't know if said correct, but anyway. (.) it just
06    → feels a (.) bit, (.7) healthy.
07    → (.7)
08 W: → yes:. (.4) and you [um,] (1.4) ↑i- th- there are
09 G:                      [Hh]
```

G's telling of how exercise makes her feel enters a self-initiated self-repair sequence (line 02), signaled by the deployment of "well". Curiously, however, "well" prefaces neither an upgrade nor a self-correction, but a repetition of "healthier". Following this she produces an upgrade, "slightly healthier", with "slightly" heavily stressed in contrast with the rest of the sequence.

W does not display any orientation to the repair, simply aligning using "yeah" in line 03; in doing so, he treats G's self-repair as unproblematically completed, and passes the turn back to G, inviting a continuation of her telling in progress. G, however, instead of continuing the telling, expresses doubt over whether her prior utterance was "correct" (line 105). As in Extract 6, despite the propositional content of "I don't know if I said correct", it does not appear to be designed to solicit repair from W, because G immediately uses "but anyway" (line 05) to return to topic-talk, rather than passing the turn to W for a response to her claim that "slightly healthier" may not have been "correct".

This is followed by "it just feels a bit healthy", effectively returning to the current talk-topic and confirming "a bit healthy" as her chosen phrasing following the repair sequence. Embedded preference for W's response to orient to the propositional content of G's turn rather than its form is thus hearable both in her swift usage of "anyway" to return to topic-talk following her repair sequence (Park, 2010), anticipating and precluding a response from W as in Extract 6, and in her ending her turn with a repeated statement of the propositional content, laying the ground for W's next turn to address it.

Extract 8: "Stepping to the sunlight" (Lesson 21)

```
04 G:    =so: u:m (0.9) >we sort of< like (.) steppi:ng,
05    →   (1.5) >maybe< to the- (.) to the ↑s::unlight:? (.)
06    →   ↓and then:,
07        (.)
08 W:     stepping [to the sunlight eh? h]hh
09 G: →            [start to-  (.)  make-] (.5) Hhye(h)ah .hh
10    →   ↓°#(yeah >i know it's not right)<#°=.hh=↑UH ANyway so
11        kind of like making ↓profits. =so >something that<
12        can be- (0.3) can be see:n and and can be
```

G coins the phrase "stepping to the sunlight" as a metaphor for a change in her job from a behind-the-scenes role to doing work making a more measurable, material contribution to the company. She indexes uncertainty about the phrase through pauses, "sort of like", "maybe", and a lengthened /s/, high tone, and rising final intonation on "sunlight" (lines 04-05). As in the previous extracts, she does not treat this uncertainty-marking as a solicitation of feedback from W, as she immediately continues her telling ("and then, start to make…"–lines 06 & 09). W, however, interjects and repeats "stepping to the sunlight", suffixed with "eh?" and laughter (line 08).

Following Robinson (2013), this bears the hallmarks of a "repair-initiating repeat" (RIR). As is common with RIRs, it specifies very accurately what piece of language is the target of the repair, but not *what it is* about that language that merits repair. RIRs are not limited to addressing issues of linguistic "correctness" or intersubjectivity of meaning; they can address such varied issues as speakers' epistemic access, their authority to perform specific social actions, the appropriateness of content or form to the context, etc. (Robinson, 2013). Whatever the intent of the speaker of the RIR, however, the nature of the repair it initiates is co-constructed interaction-internally, *ad hoc* and *post hoc*, as the talk and treatment of the RIR unfold (Robinson, 2013; Schegloff et al., 1977). In other words, whatever W's intent when speaking it, it is left to G to infer what it is about "stepping to the sunlight" that needs to be repaired.

G constructs the RIR as addressing the "rightness" of her coinage, i.e., a linguistic issue, by saying "yeah, I know it's not right" (line 10). She treats its "non-rightness" as being of secondary concern; the phrase "I know it's not right" is spoken in a quiet, creaky voice, marking it as an aside to the main thread of the conversation. Having thus indexed her awareness of the coinage's "not right-ness", she does not pursue repair of its "rightness" but moves on. In this way, she treats W's RIR as addressing the (presumably linguistic) "rightness" of her coinage, but as a solicitation of confirmation of her awareness of the

"non-rightness", not as an initiation of correction. She then appears to orient to the fact that this may lead to an extension of the repair sequence by W (as is common when treatments of RIRs do not align with the RIR-speaker's intended target of repair–Svennevig, 2008) by immediately deploying "uh, anyway" (the same 'premature cut-off and move on' device seen in Extract 5 and described by Park, 2010) with increased volume on "uh" and the first syllable of "anyway" (the same turn-competitive device anticipating interruption as seen in Extract 6, described by Levinson, 1983). Following this abrupt moving-on, her telling resumes (line 11).

4.2.3. Abandoning self-repair in progress

Extract 9: "Bouncy" (Lesson 21)
```
18 W:    [kind] of <bouncy>.
19       (1.4)
20 G:    ↑m:. (0.3) yeah, like that. (.) and <a bit:,
21    →  (.) um:,(1.7) °↓what's the word again it's- it's
22    →  getting late >=.h well it's< too late (.)(hh) for me to
23    →  come up with words° .hh $↑ANY[way,$ so-] uh yeah I
24 W:                              [   (  )   ]
25 G:    think students tend to like teachers who're <ve:ry>
26       energetic.
27       (0.9)
28 W:    but-
29 G:    n-=
30 W:    =a- (.) i mean w- ↑we all belie:ve that but
```

Extract 9 takes place during a discussion of desirable online teacher qualities, at a point when G is searching for a way to express a particular characteristic that she has in mind. She has previously used a translation of a L1 phrase and the word "energetic" but is seeking a more nuanced upgrade when W joins the wordsearch and suggests "bouncy" (line 18). G partially agrees and begins to contribute another word, when the word slips her mind: she indexes this trouble with "what's the word again, it's- it's getting late, well it's too late for me to come up with words" (lines 21-23). Having accounted for the trouble in this way, she then deploys "anyway" in order to abandon both the wordsearch and the project to upgrade "energetic" to a more nuanced word, and returns to the telling, settling

for "very energetic" instead (lines 25-26). W aligns with this (line 30), and both participants treat the return to topic-talk without completing the wordsearch as unproblematic.

Extract 10: "Tangible" (Lesson 21)

```
13 G:    >can be- (0.3) can be see:n and and can be:
14       (1.0)
15       u:m:
16       (1.0)
17   →   °mm (0.6) <what's the word again> (.) um°
18   →   (3.4)
19   →   yeah i #don't know that# (.) but
20   →   >[anyway (.) (thou:gh) people can ↑see us.]
21 W:    [i-   (.)  i   know   a   great   word h:]  h h
22       hh (1.2) .hhh (.)[i know]- $i know exactly the
23 G:                     [m : . ]
24 W:    right word for that=do y-=u:m, (.) d'you know (.)
25       tangible.
26       (2.0)
27 G:    .hh ↑O::h yes.::
```

The events of Extract 10 occur immediately after those of Extract 8, "Stepping to the sunlight". Having precluded linguistic repair of "stepping to the sunlight", G is seeking an alternative way to express her meaning when she again runs into trouble, which she indexes in lines 13 through 18 with slowed speech, pauses both filled and unfilled, and "what's the word again?", spoken in a quiet voice indicative of private speech.

After a long silence (line 18), G indicates that the wordsearch has failed to find its target, with "yeah, I don't know that" (line 19), and then initiates an abandoning and moving-on with "but anyway" (lines 19-20). On this occasion, the other-repair from W ("I- I know a great word…"–line 21), made relevant by her public linguistic trouble, is spoken at the same time as her move to anticipate and preclude it ("anyway though, people can see us"–line 20). It is W who retains the turn, and he uses it to suggest "tangible" as a candidate solution to the wordsearch (line 25), which G receives and approves (line 27).

Extracts 4 through 10 demonstrate a tendency by G to organize the interaction in such a way that (meta)linguistic repair is either minimized and moved-on from, as seen in her

imposition of a 'threshold' for it in Extracts 4 and 5, or that it does not happen at all, as seen in her moving the interaction on swiftly when she perceives that her linguistic difficulties make other-repair from W sequentially relevant, in Extracts 6 through 10.

It bears mentioning at this point that in all of G's moves to abandon or preclude (anticipated) linguistic repair, she orients to the possibility of her meaning having not been clear to W, and takes pains to repair this, even whilst abandoning the act of (meta)linguistic repair itself. In Extract 4 ("Hopping"), Extract 7 ("Healthier"), Extract 8 ("Stepping to the sunlight"), Extract 9 ("Bouncy"), and Extract 10 ("Tangible"), G moves the interaction on from the (meta)linguistic repair that is either in-progress or sequentially relevant, but in each case her next action (often following "anyway") is a restatement or rephrasing of the meaning of the original trouble-source. As such, it can not be said that she is abandoning the act of repair itself; clearly, she perceives and addresses the need to establish and confirm intersubjectivity regarding her meaning following moments of linguistic trouble. It is specifically the act of linguistic repair that her organization of the interaction tends to circumvent; whatever feature of linguistic repair is responsible for this, it is evidently not shared by the acts of explaining and reformulating and restating that she goes on to provide following her abandoning/precluding moves.

This is particularly evident in Extract 10 ("Tangible"): the beginning of the extract is in itself an explanation of the meaning of "stepping to the sunlight", which G reformulates as "something that can be seen and can be…", in orientation to the trouble W indicated with her coinage, "stepping to the sunlight". It is during this restatement that she runs into trouble and begins a wordsearch. In abandoning this wordsearch, she says "anyway, though, people can see us"; again, she does not move on to immediately resume the topic-talk that led to the trouble episode, but instead provides an explanation of the meaning of the trouble source.

4.2.4. Abandoning other-repair in-progress

The following two excerpts exemplify another circumstance in which G moves to abandon linguistic repair: linguistic other-repair initiated by W. This type of event was not common in the data, as W only rarely initiated linguistic other-repair during chatting phases of the classes; indeed, the first of the two examples (Extract 11) only came about due to a misunderstanding. Both nonetheless serve as meaningful examples of the participants' strong orientation to the prioritization of progressivity over linguistic accuracy in these chatting phases, and for that reason they are included in the analysis.

Extract 11: "Mediocre" (Lesson 18)

```
19 G:     [the one] that not up #to standard.#
20        (.4)
21        #mediocre.#
22        (0.6)
23 W: →   yes:, (.3) medi̲o̲cre, h h $mediocre steak$=
24 G: →   =ye(h) H [H    H    h   .h  .h  n(h)- .h   ↑$anyway, you
25 W: →            [↓that's a,   such an unpleasant combination
26 G: →   know what i mean$]
27 W:     of   words,  l]ike (.) a steak [should] never be
28 G:                                     [ .hhh ]
29 W:     #mediocre#.
30        (1.2)
31 G:     ↓f:i̲ne.=↑a:nd [>what] would you< u̲se then like chea̲P:_
```

In a conversation about steak (the same one that generated Extract 2, "Penentrate"), G uses the word "mediocre" (line 21) to describe steak, and W immediately pays metalinguistic attention to this phrasing, saying "yes, mediocre, haha mediocre steak", using exaggerated stress to highlight the word the first time he uses it. At this point, W continues speaking and G begins speaking, and the two turns overlap.

G's turn consists of laughter, followed by "anyway, you know what I mean" (lines 24-26). As a response to W's prior turn placing explicit metalinguistic attention on "mediocre", this response is a treatment of W's prior turn as signaling trouble with G's usage of "mediocre" and/or telegraphing repair initiation. As in previous extracts, "anyway" here appears to be designed to 'break' and prematurely end the perceived repair sequence, while "You know what I mean" here is hearable as invoking the participants' shared prioritization of progressivity and intersubjectivity over linguistic accuracy, in light of which linguistic repair of the perceived error would be unnecessary and inappropriate (if, indeed, W does "know what she means").

Meanwhile, W is saying "that's a, such an unpleasant combination of words" (lines 25-27); the overlap with G's "you know what I mean" ends at this point, and W immediately goes on to say "like a steak should never be mediocre" (lines 27-29). G's reaction ("fine, and what would you use then, like cheap?"–line 31) expressing clear reluctance, in her prosody and phrasing, to align with linguistic repair, while also soliciting an alternative to "mediocre"; this confirms that she perceived W's discussion of "mediocre" as criticism of

her usage of the word, thus also confirming that her earlier "anyway, you know what I mean" was a response to a perceived initiation of linguistic other-repair by W.

Extract 12: "Off the hook" (Lesson 21)

```
30        referred °#you, (.) >↓and [i said]#° o:h you might-
31 W:                              [ (   ) ]
32 G:    (.) you might wanna do ↑that:, ↓a:nd >she said<
33       n::o way:. .h .hh[h h ] he's o:ff the hook.
34 W:                     [u:m,]
35       (.6)
36    →  off the ↑hook?
37    →  (1.1)
38    →  ri:ght_=
39 G: →  = h ah h $ye(h)s:$
40    →  (.6)
41 W: →  ri:ght so- i c- ↓i can't [be forced]
42 G: →                           [↑h h .hh ]
43 W:    (.)↓to do that.
44       (2.0)
45 G:    ↓m.:
46 W:    (.4) ↑u:m, (.) #w- [u m #,]
47 G:    >[that's] a< ↑good thing, (.) ↓#you're
```

During a conversation in which G tells W that she has recommended him to a mutual acquaintance for a short-term contract of work, G uses the phrase "off the hook" (line 33) to explain that the mutual acquaintance rejected the idea of W doing the work. It is noteworthy at this point that the original conversation took place in Mandarin, so "off the hook" is G's translation of the mutual acquaintance's words. W appears to perceive some trouble in G's usage of the phrase, as he deploys an RIR in line 36. Following a second of silence in which G does not respond, what occurs over the following lines is that both participants work to construct W's RIR, *post hoc*, as something other than an initiation of linguistic repair.

W treats the RIR as indexing as a problem with his understanding, rather than a problem with G's linguistic accuracy, by responding to the 1.1-second silence (immediately after his repetition of off the hook) with "right" (line 38), which he goes on to repeat (line 41)

with the same vowel lengthening and prosodic profile. He then gives an understanding of
G's "off the hook" ("I can't be forced to do that", lines 41-43). This expresses a change in
W's epistemic state, from requiring repair of "off the hook" to understanding and accepting
it, with his two sayings of "right" serving as change-of-state markers (Heritage, 1984)
indexing a realization of the meaning resulting from internal processing. It is noteworthy
that the first of these change-of-state markers (line 38) came before any actual repair (G's
"yes"–line 39) was provided, suggesting that W had already begun the project of
demonstrating new understanding and acceptance of G's meaning of "off the hook" at that
point. i.e., that his realization did not result from G's provided repair. By providing the
sought clarification himself, W constructs the RIR *post hoc* as targeting his own
understanding rather than G's linguistic accuracy, and also ends the repair sequence
without involving G at all.

Meanwhile, G responds to W's RIR by resuming her previous laughter and saying "yes"
(line 39). Giving a yes/no answer is treating the RIR as a yes/no question, i.e., a request for
confirmation of correct hearing (or, plausibly, indexing 'astonishment' and thus seeking
repair of credibility–Selting, 1996). The continuation of the laughter maintains G's
orientation to the interaction, including the RIR, as social and affiliative, and continuing to
solicit laughter-reciprocation from W as a token of alignment with that characterization of
the interaction following the completion of the repair, assuming that the repair is
completed by G's "yes" in line 39. This assumption is true in the world of her *post-hoc*
construction of the RIR as a yes/no request-for-confirmation, but not true in the world of
W's *post-hoc* construction of the RIR indexing his failure to understand–hence W's non-
reciprocation of the laughter. Although the two different constructions appear to cause a
moment of disfluency (lines 44-47), G resumes the topic-talk and the interaction continues
without trouble, the two participants having both arrived at a *post hoc* construction of the
RIR as non-metalinguistic, albeit by different routes.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The extracts presented above show several specific practices employed by both
participants to organize linguistic repair in such a way as to make it conditional upon G's
alignment (an exception is observable in W's resistance to this practice in Extract 10,
"Tangible"), and subject to being abandoned or precluded when that condition is not met.
This is not to say that linguistic repair was never carried out during "chatting" phases of the
classes; rather, it is an in-depth analysis of what happened in the cases when it was
abandoned or precluded, and how the making-conditional and abandoning/precluding was
accomplished at a micro-interactional level.

Three specific features emerge as key elements in this practice: The first is G's use of "anyway" (Extracts 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11), which is marked by higher pitch and/or exaggerated stress on its first syllable in all the examples presented, and is also often accompanied by laughter and/or smile voice (Extracts 8, 9, and 11). The second is a stating or re-stating of either the trouble-source word or phrase, or a reformulation, following the move to abandon/preclude the repair (Extracts 7, 8, 9, and 10), which has the effect of demonstrating that G has a satisfactory means of expressing her meaning, while simultaneously structurally ending the repair sequence and re-focusing the interaction on the propositional content of her telling rather than its form. The third is mutual prioritization of repair when it co-occurs with an abandoning/precluding action. Though abandoning/precluding actions are frequently followed by returns-to-telling without linguistic repair when W does not engage in the repair (Extracts 4, 7, 8, and 9), we can not assume that linguistic repair *would have ensued* if the abandoning/precluding action had not been deployed, and so these examples can not necessarily be categorized as "successes"; on the other hand, whenever an abandoning/precluding action co-occurs with an engagement in linguistic repair by W (Extracts 5, 6, 10, and 11), G abandons the abandoning/precluding action and aligns with the repair (the exception to this is Extract 4, "Hopping", in which W's suggested word "bounding" does not elicit a reaction from G).

These abandonings/precludings are one way in which the participants work to construct the "chatting" phases of their classes as primarily focused on communication and fluency, rather than form and accuracy (Seedhouse, 2004). I argue that, although it may result in fewer explicit pedagogical moments, this is nonetheless a desirable element in the classes, for two reasons.

First, the frequent deployment of these practices betokens Garnet's strong orientation to the primacy of progressivity over formal accuracy–this is most clearly exemplified by her reaction to perceived linguistic repair in Extract 11 ("Mediocre). The details of this apparent preference are beyond the scope of this analysis, but it is not unreasonable to intuit that a stronger or more insistent orientation to focus-on-form by W (as in Extract 10, "Tangible") would result in interactional friction and, assuming that it resulted in more focus-on-form work being done, undesirable long-term effects on G's affect, enthusiasm and/or engagement, not to mention the intersubjectivity between her and W upon which their interaction relies (e.g., Clark, 1996; Levelt, 1989; Schegloff, 1992; Vygotsky, 1978), and consequently on the classes' ultimate success in developing her L2.

Second, in deploying these strategies, G is developing and exercising L2 strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1981); furthermore, in using them to co-construct and negotiate the parameters and characteristics of this shared interactional space with W, the participants are developing and exercising L2 interactional competence (Kramsch, 1986; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Waring, 2018), thus taking advantage of the unique affordances of

conversation-driven pedagogy (Kim, 2019; Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). Whether the value of this outweighs the value of the opportunities for linguistic repair that it precludes is a subjective question, again beyond the scope of this report; my aim is only to make the point that where opportunities for form-focused repair are lost, opportunities for the practice of strategic and interactional competence are gained. As discussed in the introduction, empirically demonstrating a high degree of complexity and nuance in the participants' collaborative accomplishment of repair with orientation to pedagogical and social concerns constitutes a demonstration of L2 IC and thus ratifies this type of interaction as a site affording its development, i.e., as an opportunity for a form of L2 learning. I contend that the analysis presented satisfies this requirement.

The study is intrinsically limited in that it applies only to these two participants, in this particular interactional environment. Whether similar or equivalent practices are deployed in G's interactions outside of these L2-learning sessions is unknowable due to the absence of such data, and so it can not be concluded that her practice of this particular strategy in class translated to an increase in any type of competence outside of class. This is not to say that it is impossible to demonstrate—with a wider dataset including G's working-life interactions, it could be done—but in the absence of such data, this study is only able to demonstrate the existence and details of the practice in the classroom setting. This study having reified and operationalized this specific practice, further studies may build upon it by identifying and observing the same practice in other domains.

Applicable levels: Tertiary

REFERENCES

Balaman, U. (2019). Sequential organization of hinting in online task-oriented L2 interaction. *Text & Talk*, *39*(4), 511-534.

Balaman, U. (2021). The interactional organization of video-mediated collaborative writing: Focus on repair practices. *TESOL Quarterly, 55*(3), 979-993.

Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017a). Development of L2 interactional resources for online collaborative task accomplishment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(7), 601-630.

Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017b). The coordination of online L2 interaction and orientations to task interface for epistemic progression. *Journal of Pragmatics, 115*, 115-129.

Belhiah, H. (2012). You know Arnold Schwarzenegger? On doing questioning in second language dyadic tutorials. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 21-41.

Bushnell, C. (2009). On NS/NNS identity and 'warrantability': The interactional co-authorship of an occasioned medium by a first and second language speaker of Japanese. *University of Hawai'I Second Langauge Studies Paper, 28*(1), 1-32.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1981). A theoretical framework for communicative competence. In A. Palmer, P. Groot, & G. Trosper (Eds.), *The construct validation of tests of communicative competence: Including proceedings of a colloquium at TESOL '79* (pp. 31-36). Washington, D.C.: TESOL

Clark, H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2019). 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* (pp. 105-129). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Theodórsdóttir, G. (2017). Constructing L2 learning spaces: Ways to achieve learning inside and outside the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *38*(2), 143-164.

Ford, C., & Thompson, S. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the projection of turn completion. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 134-184). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Girgin, U., & Brandt, A. (2020). Creating space for learning through 'Mm hm' in a L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse*, *11*(1), 61-79.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19*(1), 283-307.

Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Searching for a word as an interactive activity. In J. N. Deely & M. D. Lenhart (Eds.), *Semiotics* (pp. 129-138). New York, NY: Plenum

Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-15). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters

Hauser, E. (2015). Private speech as social action. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, *2*(2), 119-138.

Hauser, E. (2017). Avoiding initiation of repair in L2 conversations-for-learning. *Pragmatics*, *27*(2), 235-255.

Hauser, E. (2019). Handling unprepared-for contingencies in an interactional language test: Student initiation of correction as a collaborative accomplishment. In H. T. Nguyen & T. Malabarba (Eds.), *Conversation analytic perspectives on English language learning, teaching and testing in global contexts* (pp. 132-158). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. New York: Polity Press.

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversation between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 39-63.

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

Ikeda, T. (2005). The interactional achievement of being "native" and "nonnative" speakers: An analysis of multiparty interactions between Japanese and international students. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction, and Culture*, *6*, 60-79.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse*, *2*(1), 20-38.

Jefferson, G. (1987) On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *7*(2), 200-215.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 551-567.

Kasper, G. & Kim, Y. (2015). Conversation-for-Learning: Institutional talk beyond the classroom. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 390-408). New York: Wiley-Blackwell

Kim, Y. (2017). Topic initiation in conversation-for-learning: Developmental and pedagogical perspectives. *English Teaching*, *72*(1), 73-103.

Kim, Y. (2019). 'What is stoyr-steruh type?': Knowledge asymmetry, intersubjectivity, and learning opportunities in conversation-for-learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(2), 307-328.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(4), 366-372.

Kristiansen, E. D., Marstrand, A. K., & El Derbas, J. (2017). Repeating a searched-for word with an agreement token in "challenged interaction". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *50*(4), 388-403.

Koshik, I., & Seo, M. S. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text & Talk*, *32*(2), 167-189.

Kunitz, S., & Markee, N. (2016). Understanding the fuzzy borders of context in conversation analysis and ethnography. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 3*, 1-13.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(7), 1083-1110.

Kurhila, S. (2004). Clients or language learners: Being a second language speaker in institutional interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 58-74). London, UK: Continuum.

Kurhila, S. (2005). Different orientations to grammatical correctness. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 143-158). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lerner, G. H. (1987). *Collaborative turn sequences: Sentence construction and social action*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to communication*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *71*, 98-116.

Lo, C. (2020). Wearing two hats: managing affiliation and instruction when responding to learner-initiated experiences in the adult ESL classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, *11*(3), 272-291.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in society, 33*(5), 703-736.

Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Instructed vision: Navigating grammatical rules by using landmarks for linguistic structures in corrective feedback sequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*(S1), 11-29.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Meddings, L., & Thornbury, S. (2009). *Teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching*. Stuttgart, Germany: Ernst Klett Sprachen GmbH.

Park, I. (2010). Marking an impasse: The use of anyway as a sequence-closing device. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(12), 3283-3299.

Park, J. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(3), 339-360.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 3-24.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Balaman, U. (2021). The routinization of grammar as a social action format: A longitudinal study of video-mediated interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 54*(2), 183-202.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(4), 555-578.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*, 493-527.

Pica, T. (1996). The essential role of negotiation in the communicative classroom. *JALT Journal, 18*, 241-268.

Pomerantz, A. (1984a). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984b). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 152-164). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2012). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 210-228). Chichester, UK: Blackwell.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk in interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robinson, J. D. (2013). Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: The case of partial questioning repeats. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 261-292). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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). Irvington, NJ: Irvington.

Sacks, H., Schlegoff, I., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 9*, 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000, November). *On turns' possible completion, more or less: Increments and trail-offs*. Paper presented at the 2000 Annual Conference of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis* (pp. 251-266). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Selting, M. (1996). Prosody as an activity-type distinctive signalling cue in conversation: The case of so-called 'astonished questions' in repair-initiation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in conversation* (pp. 231-270). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL, 30*(3), 355-374.

Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, *35*(3), 367-392.

Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(2), 333-348.

Svennevig, J. (2018). "What's it called in Norwegian?" Acquiring L2 vocabulary items in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *126*, 68-77.

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2018). L2 teaching in the wild: A closer look at correction and explanation practices in everyday L2 interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*, 30-45.

Van Lier, L. (2014). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London, UK: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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 second language learning* (pp. 75-102). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Waring, H. Z. (2014). Managing control and connection in an adult ESL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(1), 52-74.

Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: Problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 57-67.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 244-267.