Noticing Words in the Wild

Tim Greer

Abstract This chapter draws on multi-modal Conversation Analysis to examine instances of mundane L2 interaction in which participants orient to learning new lexical items. Such sequences are initiated when one speaker pays attention to an instance of language use, either in the just-prior talk or via some environmentally available target word. This typically involves a repetition of the target lexical item which topicalizes it for the other participants and can lead to the sort of talk regularly seen in language classrooms, including explanations, alternative formulations and intersubjective repair. Occasionally such sequences also include explicit noticing of learning itself, which momentarily indexes the co-participants' relative identity categories. The study tracks episodes of L2 talk in two distinctive non-classroom contexts: (1) English dinner table talk between a Japanese student and his American homestay host family and (2) mundane Japanese talk between non-Japanese clients and Japanese hairdressers. The analysis examines the layered manner in which elements such as intonation, gaze, gesture and physical objects co-occur with the talk to accomplish noticing as an orientation to language learning. Epistemic asymmetries made relevant in the interaction afford novice language users access to the lexical resources they require and locally ascribe the expert speaker with teacher-like qualities.

Keywords Noticing · Conversation analysis · Second language interaction · Vocabulary learning · Repair · Socially distributed cognition

T. Greer (✉)
School of Languages and Communication, Kobe University, Kobe, Japan
e-mail: tim@kobe-u.ac.jp

1   Noticing as a Social Accomplishment and a Means to Language Learning

Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990, 1993, 1994, 1995) has been highly influential within Applied Linguistics over the past two and a half decades. Put simply, the hypothesis states that "(i)nput does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, that is, consciously registered" (Schmidt 2012: 27). The idea of noticing as an initial step towards language acquisition has repercussions for input, learning conditions, feedback and instruction, and has therefore been explored from a variety of psycholinguistic and cognitive perspectives (see Doughty 2001). In recognition of Firth and Wagner's call for a greater emic sensitivity toward such fundamental SLA topics (Firth and Wagner 1997), this chapter aims to extend that work towards the notion of socially distributed cognition (Kasper 2009)—the notion that learning happens via interaction and that cognition can be located outside the head to the extent that is made visible to participants by and through talk, particularly in interaction that takes place beyond the walls of the classroom.

As it was originally conceived, Schmidt's hypothesis treats noticing, attention and awareness as essentially private psychological phenomena, therefore rendering them inaccessible to the analyst or the other interactants in real time unless the speaker somehow makes them public via social interaction. However, noticing as an interactional accomplishment has also been studied from a Conversation Analytic (CA) perspective. Keisanen (2012), for example, investigated the way people in cars make use of "summonses, deictic terms, address terms, perceptual directives, and explanations" (p. 275) to accomplish noticings toward either the unfolding landscape outside or a textual artifact within the car. In CA, therefore, the focus is not on noticing only as a private cognitive state, but on the articulation of noticing (Schegloff 2007) and its consequences for the ongoing interaction. Schegloff (2007) states that "an interactional noticing need not be engendered by a perceptual/cognitive one. And many (perhaps most) perceptual/cognitive noticings do not get articulated interactionally at all" (87). More often, an articulated noticing is employed as a means of occasioning some other sort of action, and recipients treat it that way in the ongoing interaction.

Consider Excerpt (1), for example, taken from Pomerantz (1980).

Excerpt 1: Line Busy

```
1                   ((phone rings))
2 Receiver          Hello::
3 Caller            HI:::
4 Receiver          Oh:hi:: 'ow are you Agne::s
5 Caller     →      Fine. Yer line's been busy
6 Receiver          Yeuh my fu(hh) - 'hhh my
7                   father's wife called me
```

In line 5, the caller does a noticing that presumably relates to events that took place just prior to the call. However, "Yer line's been busy" is not simply a noticing and nothing further than that. The receiver of the call treats it as the initiation of an account and rightly goes on to provide a reason for why the line was busy.

Likewise in Excerpt (2), which has been reproduced from Schegloff (1980), when Carol arrives back in her dorm room without the ice cream sandwich she has gone to buy, her friends notice and comment on it, and this leads to an explanation of why she did not buy the ice cream.

Excerpt 2: Ice-cream Sandwich (Taken from Schegloff 1980)

```
151          [door squeaks]
152 S:       Hi Carol.=
153 C:       =[Hi::
154 R:        [CA:ROl, HI::
155 S: →     You didn't get en ice-cream sanwich,
156 C:       I kno:w, hh I decided that my body
157          didn't need it,
```

In both cases the person who does the noticing is in the epistemic K- position (Heritage 2012), meaning that she possesses less knowledge about the noticeable matter than the recipient does. In addition, noticing something and articulating that noticing occasions an account, explanation or reason. S is not simply noticing the missing ice cream sandwich: by doing so she is also in effect asking Carol *why* she did not get one.

So from a CA perspective, noticing may be occasioned by a perceptual event, but is often treated as an interactional event. Noticing also serves to bring about joint attention and initiate collaborative orientation (Goodwin and Goodwin 2012). In mundane talk between people with differing language expertise, the noticing of a particular language item, such as a lexical, syntactic or pragmatic form, can lead the relative expert speaker to provide an explanation (see Eskildsen this volume). Consider for example the following interaction, taken from my dataset. Mom (who is American) and Shin (who is Japanese) are watching a cooking show in Japanese on YouTube.

Excerpt 3: Harmony

```
01 Video      zentai no harmony o (.) ajiwau
              entire LK        O    taste
              ...savor all of the harmony
02 Mom        |har↑mony↓
              |((turns to Shin))
03 Shin       ah
04 Mom        same word.
05            (.)
06 Shin       yeah.
07            (2.4)
08 Shin       many many many american words, (.)
09            is used in japan. [ha:rmony or,]
10 Mom                         [ oh really? ]
11 Shin       yeah.
12 Mom        hmm.
13            ((both return to watching screen))
```

In this case, Mom is the novice language user, and in fact she probably understands almost none of the Japanese in the video without the subtitles. However, when an English loanword appears in the Japanese commentary (l. 1) she repeats it (l. 2), which serves to articulate her noticing of the word and simultaneously topicalize that segment of the video. After a brief acknowledgement for Shin, Mom then clarifies which aspect of the word she is noticing by saying that the same word exists in English. As in Excerpts (1) and (2), this then leads Shin to give an account aligned to the noticing, suggesting that he has heard Mom's noticing as a request for an account or an explanation.

From an interactional perspective then, the noticing of a word or a phrase has much in common with many other commonly found environmental noticings, even though the noticer's attention may be drawn toward a spoken (and therefore auditory) manifestation of language rather than a visual one. Although most CA work on the practices of repair is framed in terms of initiation and enactment of repair (Schegloff et al. 1977), such initiation might also be thought of as the articulation of a noticing, particularly one that departs from the repair initiator's current understanding. In doing so, the elements of the speaker's private mind become publically available, interactionally scrutinizable and sequentially consequential for the ongoing talk.

In addition, as Eskildsen and Wagner (2015) have noted, "humans use the entire body to participate in socially organized processes of understanding and learning, which ultimately challenges a strict Cartesian division between mind and body. Instead, the mind is the body" (291). The practices of noticing therefore are revealed both through spoken and embodied interaction, via a collaborative focusing of attention (Eskildsen 2018; Eskildsen and Markee 2018, Jacknick and Thornbury 2013). For example, when a teacher makes a written mistake on the whiteboard or a projected screen, students orient to it in a bodily and visible manner through gaze shifts, smiles, and stares before they articulate that noticing by initiating correction (Kääntä 2014).

Focus on Form (FoF) is a well-known pedagogical approach related to Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (Long 1991), which researchers have recently been reappraising from a CA perspective. Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013), for example, investigated FoF in relation to corrections in an L2 French classroom to demonstrating how matters that applied linguists consider cognitive, such as *attention focus* or *noticing*, constitute a locally contingent process that becomes consequential for participants themselves through routinely recognizable practices of interaction—including repetitions, delays, repairs, and the like. CA researchers do not see noticing or focus on form as an individual endeavor (belonging solely to either the teacher or the learner), but as a joint accomplishment borne out through mutual adjustments and conjoint actions in the talk.

Although Schmidt's noticing hypotheses originated from his observations of his own language learning in everyday situations outside the classroom (Schmidt and Frota 1986), Kasper and Burch (2016) point out that, ironically, much of the later research that it generated took place in the classroom rather than in the wild. Kasper and Burch use CA to examine how L2 users adopt the FoF approach in their everyday talk beyond the classroom. They demonstrate how momentary attention to lexical items or syntactic forms is occasioned and dealt with within and around other mundane actions. Their aim is "to make visible how, and with what consequences, the participants generate, sustain and abandon attention to language form through their coordinated actions in the ongoing social activity" (199–200). Such concerns are arguably less relevant to the sort of interaction that takes place in language classrooms, where a focus on language is an omnirelevant project, frequently allowing the teacher to initiate noticings about words that are made publically available for the benefit of a group of students (Waring et al. 2013) and leading to interactional trajectories that are accomplished collaboratively with the students according to the locally emergent context (Stoewer and Musk 2018) and developed "on-the-fly" (Mortensen 2011).

The current study is very much in keeping with this perspective. Its objective is to examine episodes of interactional noticing related to language form that take place "in the wild" (Hutchins 1995), such as in mundane conversation where neither speaker is pre-designated as a "teacher" and the main purpose of the talk is not language learning per se. In such episodes, noticing a lexical item[1] located in the surrounding interaction can occasion a departure from the projected trajectory of the talk, momentarily putting it on hold while the participants orient to the noticing and the pursuant accounts and explanations that become procedurally consequential. The study will examine two extended episodes of such talk, one in which the noticing is occasioned by a chance reference to an environmentally available object and the other through the use of an unrecognized word. Both cases result in extended explanations of the noticed lexemes and the analysis will explore how the participants incorporate elements of the physical environment into these explanations and how they subsequently return to the noticed word in later talk, flagging it as a recently learned item.

2   Background to the Data

The study is based on interaction collected in two very distinct situations: (a) a Japanese student living with an American family in Seattle and (b) a Bolivian man having his haircut at a Japanese hair salon. Although the settings and the languages being used are quite different, such details are not of primary consequence to the study, since the focus on noticing lexical items is equally pertinent in either context. In fact, exploring the associated interactional practices in two diverse settings lends support to the universality of the target phenomenon (Schegloff 2006).

These excerpts have been taken from two broader data sets of L2 interaction. The first consists of 44 episodes of six Japanese learners of English communicating with host families in Australia and the US. The video-recordings were collected between 2012 and 2017 and comprise approximately 15 h of mundane interaction, mostly in dinner table settings. The second data set was collected in a Japanese hair salon and tracks the interaction between two stylists and four of their customers over a series of four monthly haircuts. Three of the four customers are novice users of Japanese (one Bolivian, one American and one Chinese), and the two Japanese stylists speak only limited English.

---

[1] Although the vast majority Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis relates to grammatical forms rather than vocabulary, research that focus on the latter are not without precedent (e.g., Godfroid et al. 2010, 2013; Laufer and Hulstijn 2001).

The study adopts a conversation analytic (CA) approach (Sidnell and Stivers 2013). The data have been transcribed according to the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (2004a), and embodied aspects of the talk are indicated below the talk in a tier rendered in gray. Where it occurs, Japanese talk is represented in English over two tiers; a literal gloss and a vernacular translation. See the Appendix for further details.

3 Analysis

My analysis will focus on two kinds of word noticings and in particular on the way they are occasioned and how that leads to opportunities for learning in the wild. We will begin by looking at circumstances in which physical objects in the environment allow the novice to speculate on the meaning or origin of the word without direct information from the expert speaker. We will then examine situations in which a word from the surrounding talk is noticed by the novice and treated as unrecognized, via the processes of interactional repair.

3.1 Noticing Occasioned Through Reference to a Physical Object

The short segment of talk in this section is taken from around a dinner table in the US. Shin is a Japanese homestay student living with a host family in Seattle for 3 weeks. The aim of the analysis is to track the way Shin notices the word *sliver* and how this subsequently leads to a display of vocabulary learning. Since this involves an extended sequence of interaction, the transcripts and their analysis have been divided into several pertinent segments in order to trace the development of Shin's learning. At the point we pick up the conversation, the family has been eating pizza for some time and there are only a couple of slices left. Mom has just cut one of the last pieces into three thin strips. She gives one strip to Gran and puts another on her own plate, meaning there is one thin piece as well as one whole piece left in the box as Mom goes to close it.

Excerpt 4.1: Sliver: Shin Notices a New Word

```
01 Dad     |I'll take the last,
           |((pointing at the box))
02 Mom     the |s:kinny or=
               |((points to thin slice with knife))
```



```
03         =[the |fat one?
                 |((Mom points to thick slice with knife))
04 Dad      [|sliver.
             |((wiping mouth))
```



```
05 Dad     |the sliver.
           |((Mom's knife returns to thin slice))
06 Mom     (the) sliver.
07             |(1.5)
               |((Mom gives thin slice to Dad))
```



```
08 Shin    |((looking at pizza box; gaze tracks
             slice as Mom passes it to Dad))
```



```
09     →   sli↑ver↓
10 Mom     $sliver.$ [|mm.
                     |((nods))
11 Shin              [a::hn,
```

Since Mom has cut one slice of the pizza into smaller strips and there is also still another full slice left, there are in effect two sorts of "last pieces"; a normal sized one and one that is a third the width of a normal slice. Therefore, when Dad formulates his request as *I'll take the last* (l. 1), Mom initiates a clarification sequence by specifying the two choices to Dad, as *the skinny one or the fat one?,* pointing to each available piece with the knife as she does so (ll. 2–3). Dad then produces the word *sliver* twice, firstly in overlap with Mom in line 4, a turn segment that is hearable as the completion of his initial request, and then again in the clear in line 5. This self-repetition is undoubtedly related to the overlap (see Jefferson 2004b); however, Dad's addition of the definite article *the* in the second version also formulates it as a response to Mom's clarification initiation (in which she used *the* skinny one, *the* fat one), and also coincidently provides some further information about the word *sliver* for Shin—it is being used as a noun in this context. Mom then repeats *sliver* in line 6 as a form of receipt, making it clear that she has understood Dad's choice (Greer et al. 2009).

In the next 1.5 s Shin tracks the knife with his gaze as Mom chooses the thinner piece of pizza and puts it on Dad's plate. He has heard an unknown word used three times in quick succession, is normatively able to equate it with one of the two choices (skinny or fat) and observes that the piece that Dad has received is the thinner of the two. In short, he has had the opportunity to watch a word being used in context by two expert speakers and is in a position to make some logical assumptions about its meaning; he has physically noticed it, and perhaps formed a theory about its meaning. What matters from an interactional perspective is that he then articulates that noticing by saying *sliver* in line 9 with a rise-fall pitch pattern that marks it as an initiation of repair. In next turn Mom demonstrates that she hears it that way, by repeating the word along with a nod and a minimal uptake token. Finally, of note in this section is Shin's sequence-closing acknowledgement token *ahn* in line 11, which displays his understanding that Mom has confirmed (at least) that he has heard the word correctly. In the next segment Shin tests out his theory with the expert English speakers around him.

Excerpt 4.2: Sliver: Shin Checks the Meaning

```
12 Shin    skinny like u::h it means skinny
13 Mom     |ye[s.
           |((nods))
14 Dad        [yeah.
15 Shin    m-hm, sliver.
16         (0.3)
17 Mom     m-hm. ((a lip smack))
18         (0.3)
19 Dad     it's-
20         (0.9)/((Dad wipes mouth))
21 Shin→   °I'm learning°=
22 Dad     =the real term comes from u::h
```

Having confirmed his hearing of the target word and simultaneously accomplished an articulation of noticing, Shin immediately proceeds to offer a candidate understanding of the word's meaning in line 12; *skinny like u::h it means skinny*. Mom's description of the slice of pizza as 'skinny' (Excerpt 4.1, l. 2) becomes what Goodwin (2013) terms a *substrate* in that it appears in just-prior talk and is recycled to accomplish another action. In the next turn Mom and Dad both treat Shin's turn as repair initiation, but in subtly distinct ways. In line 13, Mom's *yes* seems to have a stand-alone finality to it—as if there is no need for further discussion—while Dad's *yeah* in line 14 has a slightly tentative quality that leaves open the possibility of further talk.

In line 15, Shin gives a brief receipt token and then repeats the focal language item once more, possibly as a form of receipt but also one that affords him a further opportunity to pronounce it and commit it to memory. Even though he does not seem to be initiating further clarification, Mom does provide a short acknowledgement and for her the sequence may potentially end there. Dad, however, seems to be preparing to extend the talk in lines 19 and 22, but before he does, Shin produces one relatively quiet turn (l. 21) that seems to be directed primarily toward himself. Almost under his breath (and while raising a piece of pizza to his mouth), he says, *I'm learning*. This is an important turn because not only does it acknowledge that he has noticed the new language item, it also provides evidence that he is monitoring his learning progress. We will return to this turn below.

At this point it is worth considering again that the noticing is not an internal, individual process, but an externally shared one. Shin's move to make the word *sliver* prominent prompted Mom and Dad to search for the significance of Shin's repetition of that particular word at that particular point in time. It is therefore not only Shin's noticing that matters, but also how the recipients treated his turn as a repair initiation through their interpretive actions. As one reviewer pointed out, when Shin reformulates *sliver* as *skinny* it is not just a psychological noticing that leads to "theory building" and then, "articulating that noticing", but more that he is checking the reference "is this what you mean?" and "what is being referred to," and this leads all three interactants to an occasion of teaching and learning.

Excerpt 4.3: Sliver: Dad Elaborates on the Focal Language Item

```
22 Dad     =the real term comes from u::h
23              (2.1)/((looks right then left-back))




24         |°like a°,
           |((touches chair))




25              (0.3)/((Dad establishes gaze with Shin))
26         piece of wood?
27 Shin    ((nodding)) m:::[n.n.n ((an uptake token))
28 Dad                    [a very |sma:ll piece of wood?
                                   |((gestures 'small'))




29 Shin                                 |((mirrors Dad's gesture))
30 Shin    |m:↑n↓
           |((Dad does stabbing gesture))
31 Dad        |(    )
              |((pricking gesture))
32         it gets in| your, (.)
                     |((gesture: finger to hand))




33 Shin    ((nodding)) [|nYah. ]
                        |((thumbs up gesture))




34 Dad               [Stuck.] Sliver. Yeah.
35              (2.2)/((Shin wipes mouth))
```

At a point where Shin has made a claim of understanding of the focal item, Dad chooses to use this as a teaching moment by expanding on the talk and providing a further usage of the new word in the form of a spoken definition (Markee 1994). He explains that sliver can also refer to a small, thin piece of wood.[2] Initially he exploits another environmentally available physical resource, the wooden chair on which he is sitting, to illustrate the phrase *piece of wood* (ll. 22–26). Although Shin gives an enthusiastic uptake of this additional information in the next-turn, Dad immediately overlaps Shin's acknowledgement to initiate a specification; since the side of the chair is fairly large (a diameter of more than 5 cm), it does not adequately fit the definition of *sliver*. In line 28 Dad uses his hands to qualify his description while reformulating the just-prior phrase *a piece of wood* to *a very sma:ll piece of wood*. Shin mirrors this gesture and gives an additional uptake token (l. 29–30).

Having conveyed the notion of sliver as a *small* piece of wood, Dad follows this up with an iconic gesture that further illustrates an important part of the meaning he is trying to convey—that the *very small piece of wood* is one that can get caught in your finger. He initially stabs the space between Shin and himself with his hand in a position that emulates holding something. He then formulates a turn that gets abandoned or at least is finished with a gesture rather than a word (see Olsher 2004 on embodied completion). The start of his turn specifies that the sliver *gets in your* and the gesture indicates that the absent object is *hand*. Shin once again indicates his understanding of this extra information and Dad repeats the focal item *sliver* once more (l. 34), along with the word *yeah*, which works to close down the sequence.

In sum, Dad has used an environmentally available physical object (the chair) to begin his explanation and refined it through embodied interactional practices, including gesture and improvised physical depiction. This explanation is the sort of account that we have seen follows episodes of noticing in Excerpts (1, 2 and 3), and in this instance it also takes on a teacher-like quality that highlights the participants' relative interactional identities (see Antaki and Widdicombe 1998), in that both Dad and Shin treat such teaching as situatedly normative.

However, recall that Dad's explanation also comes immediately after Shin has done a noticing of another kind—a noticing of his own learning in line 21. Since that noticing did not receive any specific uptake from the expert speakers, Shin then initiates a second version of it in the ongoing conversation in Excerpt (4.4).

---

[2] In other dialects of English, this would be known as a splinter.

Excerpt 4.4: Sliver

```
36 Shin   AA::::gh. (.) I'm learning.
37 Dad    yes you are.
38 Shin   HEh hah hah ha.
39            (0.5)
40 Mom    and don't forget a single thing.
41            (0.4)
42 Dad    [heh  ha  ]
43 Gran   [.heh .heh] .h-heh .heh
44 Shin   ha.
45            (12.4)
```

As a kind of coda, Shin repeats the turn that he produced earlier, but in a way that is more firmly on record. After a significant gap of silence in line 35 (Excerpt 4.3) in which the topic could have potentially ended, in line 36 he self-selects to let out a long and audible sigh that seems to indicate satisfaction rather than disappointment. This is followed by an articulated noticing concerning his own language progress, *I'm learning*. Notice this is exactly the same as the turn he produced in line 21 (Excerpt 4.2), except that it is produced more audibly and in a slot in which his audience is more available to listen—Dad has finished the explanation he was preparing and Mom has finished handing out the pizza. In line 21, even though the noticing was public, the participants seem to treat it primarily as private talk, with neither Mom nor Dad commenting on it. In contrast, this second version in line 36 receives a reaction from both of them. Dad produces a simple agreement in next turn and Mom acknowledges it as well in line 40, although in a very different way, mildly rebuking Shin in a playful manner.

It is worth considering what the act of publically noticing a change in one's own epistemic state is doing at this particular point of the conversation. Shin has already made it clear that he has learned the word as early as line 11, where he produced a change-of-state token (Heritage 1984). This constitutes his visceral reaction as he acknowledges the change from not-knowing to now-knowing (Schegloff 2007), and it is publically available to the other participants: they are aware that he has just learned the word. So in line 36 when he says *I'm learning*, Shin is doing more than just noticing, he is making that noticing relevant as a

means of extending the talk. It can be normatively understood by the others that further on-topic talk is a relevant next action at this point—although it is not a first pair part (Schegloff 2007), it would be difficult to let a comment like this go without any acknowledgement at all. Turns can be potentially interpreted as having multiple pragmatic actions. By noticing his own progress, Shin may, for example, be "fishing for a compliment", and indeed a compliment is one action that is missing from Mom and Dad's talk up until this point. *I'm learning* could even be interpreted as a form of self-congratulation, in the absence of a compliment from others around the table.

Whichever the case, Dad at least acknowledges and agrees with Shin in next turn (*Yes, you are*). Shin receipts this through laughter that may provide evidence to suggest that he hears Dad's turn as the sort of missing compliment he was looking for. Mom then formulates her response in a very different manner, with a joke-like warning not to *forget a single thing.* This is hearable as 'doing being a teacher', and thus acknowledges Shin's learning, but in a way that more explicitly indexes his identity as a relative language novice. Far from the compliment Shin may have been looking for, Mom takes this as an opportunity to playfully admonish him, and it is perhaps this sequential disjunct that occasions the next-turn laughter from Dad and Gran. Notice that Shin's laughter here is audibly later than the other two expert speakers and consists of just one brief pulse of laughter, which implies that he may not understand the joke.

In short this sequence shows us two ways of noticing a new vocabulary item, one a visceral interjection as soon as the noticing happens and the other a more thought-out formulation that can occur well after the appearance of the new word. In addition, we have seen how learning in the wild can be occasioned by the layered interplay between mundane talk, embodied interaction and physical objects that exist in the participants' immediate environment. The two slices of pizza, Mom's description of them and Dad's choice reformulated as the focal item *sliver*, as well as the embodied actions of pointing and passing the thinner slice, all serve as affordances for enabling Shin to learn a new vocabulary item. A textbook could just as easily, or perhaps even more efficiently have included this word and its gloss in a list of vocabulary, but arguably Shin's active engagement with the word in a real-life situation offers greater potential for learning the word and its uses. He puts forward

his own theory of its meaning, which is confirmed by the expert speakers and then occasions an expanded explanation. Although it may be difficult to argue that learning has taken place here, Dad's explanation is definitely a form of teaching, which suggests that Dad himself is orienting to Shin's noticing of the word sliver as an opportunity for learning.

3.2   Noticing Occasioned Through the Use of an Unrecognized Word

As demonstrated in the previous section, an orientation to learning can be occasioned by a novice speaker noticing a label being applied to something within the physical context, but this is also intricately linked to the interactional context. Interaction gives rise to words, turns and sequences that learners may notice and orient to through the practices of repair.

This section will explore a similar practice in a completely different setting. In the following extended sequence of mundane talk, which takes place in a hairdresser in Japan, we will examine how a Bolivian learner of Japanese orients to a lexical item as unknown, and then later how the Japanese interlocutors orient to it as recently learned. The L2 speaker of Japanese, Emil, is having his hair cut by Yoh and his assistant, Yumi. Although the data are largely in Japanese, these participants often communicate in an interactional medium I have called a dual-receptive language alternation (Greer 2013), such that Yumi and Yoh speak in Japanese and Emil responds in English, which is his second but stronger language.

At the point where we begin our analysis in Excerpt (5.1), Yoh is comparing the weather in Japan and Bolivia. The focus of our analysis will be on how Emil notices and later recognizes the Japanese word *shikke*, which means *moisture in the air* or *humidity*. As with our discussion of *sliver* in the previous section, we will divide the interaction into meaningful sections in order to facilitate its analysis, and in this case those sections are also divided naturally by the participants themselves, as they do other things then later return to their discussion of the target word.

Excerpt 5.1: Emil Notices a Word

```
01 Yoh      kion       wa (0.3) hikuku wa naranai   kedo,
           temperature TP       low    TP become-NG but

02         |(0.7)  ppari nihon wa (0.3) yuki ga,
            as expected japan TP        snow S
           |((gesture: fingers down, hands move down))

03         takusan furimasu  ne.
           a lot   falls-POL IP
           It doesn't get that cold, but Japan gets a lot of snow, right?

04 Emil     ah yes
05             (3.6)

06 Yoh      shikke   ga:, (0.2) shikke ga o:i des kara  ne.
           moisture S         moisture S much CP because IP
           The moisture- because it is so moist, right?

07 Emil→    |a- shikke?
            |((looks at Yoh, smiling))
```



```
08 Yoh      shikke  ga=
           moisture S

09 Emil     = |(shikke [na- nani)
                             what
               W-what's shikke?
             |((holds gaze at Yoh, smiling))

10 Yoh               [sh(h)ikke wa ne: e::: >shitsudo.<
                      moisture TP IP  HM    humidity
                     Shikke is like umm, shitsudo.

11             (0.6)
12 Yoh      shi:tsu:do:=
           humidity

13 Yumi     =wo- n-|wa(h)ter    |johki
                                 steam
              ((|hands even |raises RH |turns to Emil))
```

```
14 Yoh     ahahahaha a-  schi::mu
                      CS   steam
15                 (0.4)
16 Yumi    a- |schi::mu=
               steam
            |((moves head to side))
```



```
17 Emil    =ah steam |yes ah ah: hih- humiditeh?=
                     |((fist clap))
18         =|no.
            |((Yumi's head remains to the side))
19              (1.0)
20 Yoh     humidity
21 Yumi    |so:iu koto  kana:=
            that  thing maybe
           I wonder if that's it.
           |((looks away, head to side))
```



```
22 Yoh     =>so:iu koto kana=chotto shirabete<
             that  thing maybe just find out
            I wonder if that's it. Go and look it up.
```

```
23 Yumi     h[ahahah
24 Yoh       [ss hahah
25 Yumi      [|sh(h)irabe (t(h)oku)
                find out   in advance
                I'll go find out.
             |((walks off laughing))
```



```
26 Yoh      ha| haha .hh
               |((turns Emil's seat))
27 Yoh      soredewa ichido (0.3) kochira de
            okay     once          here-POL at
28          shampu: o shima:s
            shampoo O do-POL
            Okay, we'll just shampoo you over here.
29 Emil     okay
30 Yoh      ha::i
            yes
            Okay
31          ((Emil moves to the shampoo seat,
             Yumi goes behind mirror))
```

In line 6, Yoh's discussion of the weather leads him to use the word *shikke* (which means 'damp air' or 'humidity' or 'moisture in the air'). He produces it twice in this turn, pausing after the first occasion and then incorporating the repeated version into the syntax of the ongoing sentence, a turn that is not particularly lexically or grammatically difficult. This may allow Emil to focus in on *shikke* as the only part of the sentence that he does not understand. Listening to it twice potentially affords him

the opportunity to be sure that he has heard the pronunciation correctly. In line 7 then, when Emil repeats the word *shikke* with upward intonation he is other-initiating repair, but at its most fundamental level he is also noticing or paying attention to this lexical item as something unrecognizable to him, and then goes on to do a second, more explicit, version of this by asking *What's shikke*? (l. 9). In Schmidt's terms he is doing a confirmation check (Lyster 1998).

In line 10, and in overlap with Emil's question, Yoh attempts to unpack the word by replacing it with a synonym, *shitsudo* (humidity), which is a more formal, slightly more scientific or bookish word that means roughly the same as *shikke*. However, Emil does not indicate any understanding of that word either (as evidenced by the 0.6 s gap in l. 11) and Yoh repeats his synonym with extended vowels, which suggests a display of thinking.

Yumi then self-selects in line 13 to proffer a related English word ('water') followed immediately by another Japanese word that might be considered within the same word family—(*johki*/'steam'). She accompanies her delivery with iconic gestures that help to convey a sense of the word, raising her hands into the air to suggest that the water has floated away as she self-repairs to the word steam, then looking back to Emil to monitor his reaction.[3] Although this still does not elicit a response of recognition from Emil, it does get one from Yoh and leads him to produce a phonetically Japanese version of the English equivalent (*schiimu*/'steam') in line 14. Although Yumi does not appear to consider steam the most appropriate translation (based on her non-committal intonation and embodied display of doubt in l. 16), the word does enable Emil to make a guess of his own that eventually turns out to be correct—the word *humiditeh* in line 17. Note, however, that this is not an English word that either Yoh or Yumi appears familiar with and this leads them to consult the dictionary. Immediately after he formulates *humiditeh* in line 17, Emil tags it with a negatively-valenced confirmation initiator *no?* which displays his orientation toward his guess as being potentially wrong. In a slot where a response is sequentially due, Yumi does not provide any uptake to confirm or reject Emil's candidate repair, and her head remains cocked to the side, suggesting she does not recognize this English word. In line 20, Yoh repeats the word humidity and in line 21 Yumi makes her display of non-understanding more concrete by verbalizing the message her physical

---

[3] Due to the camera angle, the screenshots in this transcript are largely taken from reflections in the mirror, so when Yumi is looking forward in the third figure in line 13, she is actually establishing mutual gaze with Emil via the mirror, a practice that I have explored in greater detail in Greer (2013).

Fig. 1 Emil and Yoh are at the shampoo chair. Yumi is standing some distance away behind the mirror after having just looked up the word on her laptop

stance has been projecting, saying *I wonder if that is it* while looking away. In short, the conversation has reached an impasse with neither party able to confirm the link between the two words in their preferred language. The problem is temporarily set aside by Yoh in line 22, when he perfunctorily admits that he also does not know the English word. He repeats Yumi's just-prior turn then quickly directs her to look it up in the dictionary, a move that suspends the sequence so that he can direct Emil to the shampoo sink. It is worth noting, therefore, that all participants are not always equally invested in resolving trouble in any given instance of interaction. Yoh has multiple involvements in this talk (Raymond and Lerner 2014) and arguably he is first and foremost committed to cutting Emil's hair rather than the small talk that goes on while he is doing that, whereas Yumi, who is not directly taking part in the haircut, is free to carry out the interaction with Emil. Their laughter in lines 23–26 attests to the relatively abrupt ending of this sequence, and Yumi goes to another room to look up the word *shitsudo* in an online dictionary and Yoh and Emil move to the shampoo chair for a period of time.

Throughout this sequence the participants have used a variety of means to explain the target word, including same-language synonyms, other-language equivalents and mimed approximations. However they also seem to be orienting to the problem as one entirely consisting of finding an equivalent lexical item—they make no effort to try to explain the word in a Japanese sentence, but instead simply give one-word answers. This may be a strategy that orients to Emil's limited level of Japanese as well as Yumi and Yoh's limited level of English.

The talk shown in Excerpt (5.2) takes place about 1 min later, when Emil's shampoo is just about to start and Yumi has finished looking up the word *shitsudo* in an online dictionary and is able to confirm to Emil that it does indeed mean humidity. As shown in Fig. 1, she is approximately 5 m away from Emil at this point.

Excerpt 5.2: Yumi Confirms the Meaning in English

```
01 Emil     then if I get (.) tired? (0.4)
02 Yoh      ah:hn
03 Emil     >I go home.<
04 Yoh      h'h hah hah
05          chotto   tsukareta n da ne
            a little exhausted N CP IP
            You get a little tired.
06 Emil     °yes°
07          (10.2)/((Yoh runs the water))
08 Yumi     |sakki no wa:
            before N TP
            That thing we were talking about before?
            |((Yumi pokes head out from behind mirror))
09              (1.2)/((Emil looks to Yumi))
10 Yumi     etto: shitsudo?
            HM      humidity
            Um, shitsudo?
11 Yoh      |shitsudo
            |((looks back to Yumi))
12 Yumi     e- |one more
               |((beckons from Emil to self))
13 Emil     ah- humidity?=
14 Yumi     =aah- |s- [so-  so:.
             CS    th- that that
            Yes yes yes. That's it.
                  |((nodding))
15 Emil                [ah- (real-)
16 Yoh      ha[hahaha
17 Yumi       [shikke
18 Emil     |(s)hitsudo
            |((smiling))
19 Yoh      sh(h)itsu[do heh
20 Yumi             [heh shitsudo
21 Yoh      ha[hahahaha
22 Yumi       [hehehh
23 Yoh      taoshima:su
            put down-POL
            I'll just let your seat down.
24          ((seat moves))
25          ((water runs, Yoh shampoos Emil's hair))
26          ((Yumi cleans the floor, conversation lapses))
```

Since there has been a significant change in the physical and interactional participant constellation in the minute or so since the previous excerpt, Yumi's first task is to renegotiate the participant framework so that she can re-enter the talk. She waits until a lapse in the talk between Yoh and Emil at line 7, then restarts the prior talk by marking it as such in line 8 with an upward-intoned incomplete TCU and waiting for Emil to acknowledge it. She then continues in line 10 by offering the Japanese word she has just searched for in the dictionary. In line 11 Yoh repeats this and shifts his gaze to Yumi, demonstrating that he is also aligning himself as a relevant recipient to whatever telling Yumi is projecting. Rather than attempting to pronounce the word humidity, however, in line 12 Yumi uses gestures and a simple English phrase to ask Emil to repeat the English word he said earlier, which he does in line 13 leading Yumi to then confirm that this is the word that she has found online. During the subsequent laughter, Yumi also produces the original trouble source *shikke* (l. 17) as well as multiple instances of the synonym *shitsudo*, indicating that she has looked up both of them and found that *humidity* is an adequate English equivalent for either. The sequence ends in line 23 as Yoh re-orients to his primary task of shampooing Emil's hair, but this brief exchange demonstrates that both parties have undergone a change in their lexical understanding and that Emil now has at least passive knowledge of noticed word *shikke* and the lexical equivalent that it occasioned.

Finally, in Excerpt (5.3), we will consider a reoccurrence of this focal item, which takes place about 14 min later. Here the original word *shikke* again appears in a separate part of the conversation and Yoh marks it as a newly acquired word for Emil. By this time Emil and Yoh are back in the styling chair and have been comparing the two cities of Kobe and Kyoto.

Excerpt 5.3: Yoh Flags the Target Word as Just Learned

```
01 Emil      demo (0.8) if- (0.9) for (.) living?
             but

02           (0.9) I think kobe is (.) °better°
03                 (0.6)
04 Yoh       a:::h (.) so:h des ne.
             CoS       that CP  IP
             Yes, it is, isn't it?

05 Emil      yes
06 Yoh       ha:i kyo:to (0.3) heh hah
             yes

07 Emil      kyoto is (0.6)
08 Yoh  →    heheh (1.4) kyoto wa: (0.5)
                          Kyoto TP

09           sakki  no hanashi des kedo,
             before LK talk    CP  but

10 Emil      n[:
             RT
             yeah

11 Yoh        [shikke   des ne.
                moisture CP IP
             With Kyoto, getting back to what we were saying before,
             it's the shikke (moisture in the air).

12                 (0.6)
13 Emil →    a:h |yes °sh[ikke]°
                 |((smiling))
14 Yoh                  [ha:i]
                         yes

15                 (0.5)
16 Yoh       totemo ooi  des hehe[hehehe
             very   much CP
             There's so much of it.

17 Yumi                         [heheheh
18                 (0.4)
19 Yoh       $totemo ooi  des yo:$
              very   much CP  IP
             There's so much of it!

20                 (6.5)
```

In line 8, Yoh produces a sentence that is essentially the same as the one that originally caused the trouble for Emil: *Kyoto wa shikke ga totemo ooi des* (Kyoto has quite a lot of humidity). Recall that the turn that contained the original trouble source in Excerpt (5.1) was (*nihon wa*) *shikke ga oi des kara* (because Japan has a lot of humidity). The subject is different, but apart from an intensifier and a causal connective, the formulation is basically the same. However, notice that in line 9 Yoh inserts a parenthetical segment into the turn-in-progress (*sakki no hanashi des kedo*/'as we said earlier'), which receives uptake from Emil in line 10. This serves to flag Yoh's production of the target word *shikke* in next turn (l. 11), and this re-indexing of the item as "just learnt" is in itself a form of expert speaker-initiated noticing (see Eskildsen this volume). Emil gives an uptake token in line 13 and repeats the newly acquired word, indicating that he now recognizes the word and has perhaps learned it, at least in the short term. This allows Yoh to complete his turn-in-progress in line 16, but also shows their joint-orientation to the earlier sequences in which they arrived at mutual understanding through a prolonged process of interactional repair. This flagging then is also a sort of noticing, this time by Yoh, who notices that the word he is about to use is one that is new to Emil, and therefore may need extra time to process. As Brouwer and Wagner (2004) have shown, such cross-episodic comparisons of language use can prove beneficial in demonstrating development of interaction over time.

4   Concluding Discussion

Language learning is situated and attentionally gated (The Douglas Fir Group 2016), meaning that it takes place in a given sequential and social context and it is predicated on the learner noticing new language forms. This study has examined instances of mundane L2 talk in which the participants orient to language learning via the interactional practices of noticing. Such sequences are initiated when one speaker pays attention to an instance of language use, whether it is present in the just-prior talk or via some form of environmentally available target word. The learner's noticing typically involves a repetition of the target lexical item which topicalizes it for the other participants. This can lead to further talk of the sort that is regularly seen in language classrooms, including explanations, alternative formulations and intersubjective repair (see Waring et al. 2013). The multi-modal analysis has examined the layered manner in which a variety of elements such as intonation, gaze, gesture, language choice, proxemics and physical artifacts co-occur with the talk to accomplish the noticing as an orientation to language learning. Epistemic asymmetries were temporally resolved, enabling novice learners to gain access to the lexical resources they require and locally ascribing the expert speaker with teacher-like qualities.

In the first instance, we witnessed how the novice language speaker noticed an unfamiliar word being applied to a particular object (a piece of pizza) and was able to infer the relevance of its distinguishing feature (its thinness) to the descriptor that was used. His articulated noticing made public his personal hypothesis about its meaning and led to further explanations of other usages of the same word that were delivered in relation to the sequential and physical environment. This suggests some of the ways in which language learning in the wild might differ from that in the classroom, where opportunities to make inferences about incidental language use in relation to descriptions of environmental objects can be limited or at best, artificial. It is worth recalling that both the expert and the novice treated the novice user's noticing as an opportunity for language learning, implicitly (the expert) by responding with teacher-like explanations and explicitly (the novice) by saying *I'm learning* (Excerpt 4.2, l. 21 and Excerpt 4.3, l. 36).

In the second episode the noticing was also occasioned by the expert speaker's use of a word that was unknown to the novice, but in this case it was not linked to any environmentally available object. As in the first case, the articulation of noticing was treated as an initiation of repair, and the expert speakers used a range of linguistic and non-verbal resources to enact repair. In addition to gestures, gaze and same-medium explanations through the use of Japanese synonyms, they also took advantage of known English words and eventually confirmed the meaning via the use of an online dictionary. This suggests that the original noticing leads to language exchange, not just one-sided teaching—Yumi and Yoh learned the word *humidity* while teaching Emil *shikke* and *shitsudo*—a situation derived from the multilingual competences they used to address the interactional trouble. Moreover, this language exchange later led one of the speakers to interactionally flag the word as newly learned when it appeared in subsequent conversation.

Finally, the analysis has shown that articulated noticing is an integral element of socially-distributed cognition, suggesting that a good deal of what goes on when we think, hypothesize and learn takes place outside the mind and within the process of interaction. Even though the noticing itself may have been initiated by one of the parties, once articulated publically it results in joint attention and is co-constructively resolved.

Appendix: Transcript Conventions

The talk has been transcribed with standard Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson 2004a). Japanese talk has been translated based on the three-tier system used by Greer, Ishida and Tateyama (2017):

First tier: `original talk` (plain text in Courier)
Second tier: *`gloss translation`* (Courier italics)
Third tier: *prose rendering* (Times New Roman italics)

Embodied elements of the interaction are noted in gray font and the onset of the action is indicated in the talk via a vertical bar. Where the physical action does not coincide with talk, the silence is timed and appears on the same line as the description, separated by a forward slash. Abbreviations used for Japanese morphemes in the word-by-word gloss tier are as follows:

CP	copula (e.g., *da, desu*)
H	hesitation marker (e.g., *e::, ano*)
IP	interactional particle (e.g., *ne*, *sa*, *no, yo, na*)
LK	linking particle (*no*)
N	nominalizer (*no, n*)
O	object marker (*o*)
Q	question marker (*ka* and its variants)
S	subject marker (*ga*)
TP	topic marker (*wa*)
CS	change of state token (*ah*)
RT	receipt token
NG	negative (−*nai*)
POL	polite form

References

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.

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

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). "We're learning a lot of new words": Encountering new vocabulary outside of class. *The Modern Language Journal, 102*(Supplement 2018), 46–63.

Eskildsen, S. W. (this volume). 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). Cham: Springer.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Markee, N. (2018). L2 talk as social accomplishment. In R. Alonso (Ed.). *Speaking in a second language* (pp. 69–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2015). Embodied L2 construction learning. *Language Learning, 65*(2), 268–297.

Fasel Lauzon, V., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Focus on form as a joint accomplishment: An attempt to bridge the gap between focus on form research and conversation analytic research on SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 51*(4), 323–351.

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

Godfroid, A., Housen, A., & Boers, F. (2010). A procedure for testing the noticing hypothesis in the context of vocabulary acquisition. In M. Pütz & L. Sicola (Eds.), *Cognitive processing in second language acquisition* (pp. 169–197). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Godfroid, A., Boers, F., & Housen, A. (2013). An eye for words: Gauging the role of attention in incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition by means of eye-tracking. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*(3), 483–517.

Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics, 46*(1), 8–23.

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (2012). Car talk: Integrating texts, bodies, and changing landscapes. *Semiotica, 191*, 257–286.

Greer, T. (2013). Establishing a pattern of dual-receptive language alternation: Insights from a series of successive haircuts. *Australian Journal of Communication, 40*(2), 47–61.

Greer, T., Bussinguer, V., Butterfield, J., & Mischinger, A. (2009). Receipt through repetition. *JALT Journal, 31*(1), 5–34.

Greer, T., Ishida, M., & Tateyama, Y. (Eds.). (2017). *Interactional competence in Japanese as an additional language*. Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 45*(1), 30–52.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jacknick, C., & Thornbury, S. (2013). The task at hand: Noticing as a mind-body-world phenomenon. In J. M. Bergsleithner, S. N. Frota, & J. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Noticing and second language acquisition: Studies in honor of Richard Schmidt* (pp. 309–329). Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jefferson, G. (2004a). Glossary of transcription symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jefferson, G. (2004b). A sketch of some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 43–59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kääntä, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 66*, 86–105.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL, 47*, 11–36.

Kasper, G., & Burch, A. R. (2016). Focus on form in the wild. In R. A. van Compernolle & J. McGregor (Eds.), *Authenticity, language and interaction in second language contexts* (pp. 198–232). Bristol: Channel View.

Keisanen, T. (2012). "Uh-oh, we were going there": Environmentally occasioned noticings of trouble in in-car interaction. *Semiotica, 191*, 197–222.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 1–26.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*(1), 51–81.

Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second language acquisition studies. In E. Tarone, S. Gass, & A. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 89–116). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Palloti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 135–162). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221–245). London: Continuum.

Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: "Limited access" as a "fishing device". *Sociological Inquiry, 50*(3–4), 186–198.

Raymond, G., & Lerner, G. (2014). A body and its involvements. Adjusting action for dual involvements. In P. Haddington, T. Keisanen, L. Mondada, & M. Nevile (Eds.), *Beyond multitasking: Multiactivity in social interaction* (pp. 227–246). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question?'. *Sociological Inquiry, 50*(3–4), 104–152.

Schegloff, E. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality* (pp. 70–96). London: Berg.

Schegloff, E. (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 organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 361–382.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 206–226.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165–209). London: Academic.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language teaching and learning (Technical report no. 9)* (pp. 1–64). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Schmidt, R. (2012). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, S. K. Bhatt, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Perspectives on individual characteristics and foreign language education* (pp. 27-50). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237–326). Rowley: Newbury House.

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stoewer, K., & Musk, N. (2018). Impromptu vocabulary work in English mother tongue instruction. *Classroom Discourse, 10*(2), 123–150.

The Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal, 100*(Supplement 2016), 19–47.

Waring, H. Z., Creider, S. C., & Box, C. D. (2013). Explaining vocabulary in the second language classroom: A conversation analytic account. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 2*(4), 249–264.