# L2 VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH CONVERSATION:
## A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS[1]

**KYUNGRAN JUNG**

*University of Hawai'i*

## ABSTRACT

Through the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA), this study examines conversational interactions and L2 vocabulary development through conversations between conversation partners and L2 learners in one English language teaching institution. L2 learners often face problems in producing a target lexical item during conversations and seek assistance from their conversational partners who are mostly native speakers and fluent target language speakers. So, how do L2 learners talk and learn L2 vocabulary while having a conversation? Can we trace L2 learner's vocabulary development over time, and how can we know that the learner actually learned the vocabulary through the conversation? Twelve hours of conversation involving one focal participant during a six-week term and two more conversations after three months were audio-recorded and transcribed. The analysis focuses on the instances of the L2 learners' repair initiation and their conversation partners' repair completion when facing a vocabulary production problem. The L2 learners used three different resources to initiate repair while searching for a word and the conversation partners provided the target word by orienting to the turn prior to the trouble source turn or the context as well as their role as a language expert or language teacher. In order to talk and learn, L2 learners repeated the target word or incorporated it into their utterances. In terms of vocabulary development over time, one focal participant's conversations were traced and three target lexical items in a previous conversation were found to be used in a later conversation without any hesitation or trouble.

## INTRODUCTION

The role of conversational interactions in the development of a second language (L2) has been central in the second language acquisition (SLA) literature. With regard to the pedagogical idea of conversation-for-learning (i.e., *Gesprächsrunde*), Kasper (in press)

has said, "at the very least, participating learners will improve their L2 fluency, and in the best case, will make unpredictable but specific gains in their L2 lexis, morphosyntax, pragmatics, or discourse ability through target language practice." Influential on theoretical grounds is Hatch's (1978) key insight that learners can learn a second language *through* interacting rather than just manifesting what they have already learned in interaction. However, as Markee (2000) pointed out, despite considerable progress in understanding how L2 learners use talk to learn new language, theory construction needs empirical verification, and the details of how learners actually deploy talk to learn on a moment-by-moment basis have yet to be established.

Through the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA), this study examines conversational interactions and L2 vocabulary development during conversations between conversation partners and L2 learners in one English language teaching institution. First, previous studies and relevant issues in L2 vocabulary acquisition through interaction will be reviewed, and the adoption of CA as an alternative approach in SLA research will be discussed. The data analysis consists of two parts. First, it will focus on how L2 learners deploy talk to learn or develop L2 vocabulary in interactions with conversation partners when facing a production problem. In other words, it will investigate how L2 learners use different resources to initiate repair, how the repair sequences are co-constructed by the participants and how the L2 learner orients to learn and talk on a moment-by-moment basis in talk-in-interaction. In the second part, the use of target vocabulary from previous conversations will be traced in order to examine the L2 learner's vocabulary development over time. In addition, this study will explore the potential of a CA approach to SLA, discuss several methodological issues, and offer suggestions for future study.

### *Interaction and L2 Vocabulary Development*

Vocabulary use and development has been recognized by researchers and learners as a major aspect of learning a new language, and particularly SLA researchers have increasingly paid attention to vocabulary learning (Ellis, 1994). Huckin and Coady (1999) conducted an extensive literature review, focusing on key unresolved issues of incidental vocabulary acquisition, such as the actual mechanisms of incidental acquisition,

the type and size of vocabulary needed for accurate guessing, and the effects of input modification. However, the studies they reviewed were mostly about vocabulary acquisition through reading (i.e., written texts), irrespective of different purposes and methods. As Ellis (1994) pointed out, there has been relatively little attention to vocabulary learning from oral input[2].

Some studies, though, have focused on L2 vocabulary acquisition from oral input, such as oral journals in writing (Brown, Sagers, & LaPorte, 1999), lessons (Dobinson, 2001), academic listening (Vidal, 2003), modified input (and output) through interaction (Ellis, 1994; Ellis, Heimbach, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994; He & Ellis, 1994; Hwang, 2002; Loschky, 1994; Nagata, Aline, & Ellis, 1994), and communicative tasks (Newton, 1995, 2001). In particular, Ellis and others were interested in L2 vocabulary acquisition through interaction and conducted several studies as listed above. It is notable that those studies were conducted within the theoretical framework of the Interaction Hypothesis (IH) (Long, 1985)[3], which proposes that the effect of modified input through interaction will facilitate comprehension and acquisition. However, the mixed results of these studies (Ellis, 1994; Ellis, et al., 1994; He & Ellis, 1994; Hwang, 2002; Loschky, 1994; Nagata, Aline, & Ellis, 1994) revealed that, while the interactionally modified input (or output) facilitates comprehension, it is very difficult to *link* the comprehension/interaction (more specifically, *negotiated* interaction) and acquisition directly.

For example, Ellis, Heimbach, Tanaka, and Yamazaki's (1994) study focused on the extent to which an interactional context facilitates language learning by comparing nonmodified, premodified, and interactionally modified input on both comprehension and

---

[2] On this matter, Brown, Sagers, and LaPorte (1999) note,

One possible roadblock to more research into incidental vocabulary acquisition from oral input may be the lack of a rough map of where such research may need to go. With so much done on acquisition from written texts, researchers with written discourse can follow many leads into new territory. With oral texts, less is known. Part of the problem lies in the difficulty in capturing and analyzing anything resembling natural oral discourse. …natural oral discourse, on the other hand, is more dynamic and fleeting. If it is captured and made static, on tape for example, it generally requires a transformation into written form before it can be examined and reexamined (p. 261).

[3] The general claim of the IH is that input is necessary for acquisition but that it is not sufficient for SLA. In addition, to make input comprehensible, modifications to the interactional structure of conversation were found to be important. Thus, interactionally modified input facilitates comprehension, which in then promotes acquisition. Later, Long and others referred to interactional modification as *negotiation* and produced a fruitful, and often controversial, line of research in this area (Pica, 1994).

vocabulary learning. In their conclusion, they noted, "interaction may help learners work toward comprehension because it gives them control over the input they receive and enables them to systematically identify and solve comprehension problems" (p. 83). However, no clear effect of interaction on the acquisition of new words was demonstrated, and this seems to be the case in the other studies as well. Loschky (1994) examined the effect of modified input and interaction using Japanese as the target language and showed that even though moment-to-moment comprehension was much higher in the group with negotiated interaction, no differences in vocabulary retention were found among experimental groups with or without modified input and interaction. He concluded that "positing a simple linear relationship between comprehension and intake seems not to be warranted" (p. 320). Hwang (2002) examined the effect of negotiated interaction on L2 vocabulary acquisition by focusing on the acquisition of Korean kinship terms by beginning learners of Korean. He found that negotiated interaction produced more target word items than non-negotiated input only, but the higher rate of repetition in the negotiated-interaction group had no effect on learners' comprehension of L2 word meanings or on their vocabulary acquisition.

In fact, most of the studies addressing on L2 learners' displays of difficulty in producing a lexical item were conducted under the framework of *communication strategies* (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Faerch & Kasper, 1983a; Faerch & Kasper, 1983b; Paribakht, 1985), generally defined as "the means that speakers use to solve their communicative problems" (Paribakht, 1985, p. 132) and considered as "indicative of gaps in the learner's lexical knowledge" (Brouwer, 2003, p. 536). In their comprehensive review, Dörnyei and Scott (1997) provided a variety of taxonomies of communication strategies found in the literature, such as circumlocution (paraphrase), approximation, code switching, and omission. However, despite the main interest in L2 learners' strategies to solve lexical problems, most research on communication strategies has focused on identifying and classifying the different kinds of strategies in communicating lexical items, not on examining the roles of these strategies in the interaction and the learners' L2 vocabulary development.

A common vein of the interactional modification studies is that they investigate SLA through interaction, but focus more on the (modified) input than on the interaction itself,

and interaction is only seen in a limited sense as a setting for providing comprehensible input.[4] Moreover, some researchers have pointed out the limitations of using the experimental methodology: (a) the artificial nature of the interaction (Hwang, 2002; Markee, 2000), (b) control of input, such as time on task and the amount of input among different groups (Loschky, 1994; Ellis et al., 1994), and (c) quantification of data (Markee, 2000). Overall, Firth and Wagner (1997) argued that methodological practices in SLA research that investigate acquisition through interactive discourse are not erroneous but *biased* by reducing social identities to 'subjects' (at best to a binary distinction between natives and non-natives), coding, quantifying data, experimental settings rather than naturalistic ones, and etic concerns and categories over emic ones. Recently, Kasper (in press) discussed how we could understand an emic view in the analysis of interaction and how the prevalent assumptions, such as a view of tasks as superior to free conversation, in the IH could lead us to investigate the interaction in a narrow sense.  She maintained that "Rather than zooming in on a pre-determined type of interactional sequence, the entire event that learners participate in deserves close scrutiny."

In the following section, I will discuss some potential contributions of CA as an important methodological resource for SLA, based on previous researcher's discussions.

### CA and SLA

CA, a branch of ethnomethodologies originating from the sociological interest in people's everyday interaction, has been adopted as an approach to investigate talk-in-interaction between native-nonnative or nonnative-nonnative in the learning environments by SLA researchers (e.g., Hauser, 2003; Hosoda, 2000; Kasper, in press; Kim, 2003; Kurhila, 2001; Markee, 2000; Mori, 2002). This makes relevant questions about what CA is and what characteristics of CA can make contributions to the field of SLA. The discussion of this issue will be based on previous researchers' discussions.

Based on the historical background and ethnomethodological foundations of CA, Markee (2000) defined CA as "a form of ACD (analysis of conversational data) that

---

[4] It is understandable that input is conceived as the most important source for L2 acquisition since the IH was derived from Krashen's (1980) original concept that comprehensible input is necessary for L2 acquisition. Hauser (2003) noted that the view of *interaction as input source* is not problematic in terms of a cognitive psychology perspective, but it becomes problematic if the main interest is interaction itself.

accounts for the sequential structure of talk-in-interaction in terms of interlocutors' real-time orientations to the preferential practices that underlie, for participants and consequently also for analysts, the conversational behaviors of turn-taking and repair in different speech exchange systems" (p. 25).

Markee (2000) notes that CA and SLA studies look mutually incompatible in terms of the perspective on the description of language as cognition or behavior and the view of cognition as individual or as an individual and socially distributed phenomenon. However, the way of perceiving repairs in SLA and CA can potentially be the grounds for a convergence of perspectives between SLA researchers and CA analysts. According to him, the view of SLA researchers that conversational repair is a "sociopsychological engine" (p. 31) for learners to get comprehended input is broadly consistent with repair in CA, which can be seen as an example of "socially distributed cognition" (Schegloff, 1991). Markee maintains that the microanalytical power of CA represents "one way of demonstrating how micro-moments of socially distributed cognition instantiated in conversational behavior contribute to observable changes in participants' states of knowing and using new language" (p. 3).[5] In line with his argument, this study takes the strong stance that CA can be applied to examine conversational practices such as sequential organizations, turn-takings, and repairs and investigate the processes of socially distributed cognition and how speakers use each other's talk to *learn* new language.

Other than the above discussion, there are three things commonly discussed by the researchers regarding the issue of adopting CA for SLA studies and some potential benefits of it. First, highly detailed transcription from CA seems to be very beneficial for SLA researchers who attempt to pay closer attention to details of interactional conduct (Kasper, in press) and to empirically demonstrate learners' first getting comprehended input and later producing comprehended output (Markee, 1994). Second, different from using prefabricated tests or tasks to measure vocabulary acquisition in experimental settings, another potential contribution of CA to SLA is that a researcher can look more

---

[5] Kim (2003) also proposes that one of the research questions fit for a CA-oriented SLA study would be to investigate whether "collaboratively achieved micro-moments of cognition" (Markee, 2000, p. 33) *from the learner's perspective* are occurring in the data and when and how these happen.

closely into the learners' use of a given linguistic item in natural interaction (Kim, 2003). Some researchers (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Wagner, 1996; Markee, 2000) have already demonstrated and discussed that the findings gained in experimental settings should not be generalized into ordinary conversation, since conversational practices and members' orientations are different in different types of interactions. Last but not the least, in terms of the methodological advantages of CA-for-SLA, Mori (2002) and Kasper (in press) advocate the adoption of an emic view that treats actions, activities, social categories, and so on, as "relevant only to the extent that the co-participants make such objects relevant through their displayed orientations to them" in the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction (Kasper, in press). Therefore, which features of the participants or of the setting become relevant at the moment for the participants themselves can be revealed through the participants' behaviors at each moment of interaction (Mori, 2002).

However, detailed analyses of SLA processes in the moment-by-moment talk-in-interaction of L2 learners are still rare. Kasper (in press) points out that evidence that CA can provide substantial insights into second language *development* is lacking.[6] Therefore, the general goal of the present study is to investigate when and how L2 learners deploy talk to learn the L2 in the interaction between the conversation partners and L2 learners and pursue the consequences of it in the long term through the framework of CA. More specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How does an L2 learner initiate repair (i.e., what kinds of resources are used for the learner's self-initiated repair) when facing an L2 vocabulary problem?

2. How are the repair sequences accomplished through talk-in-interaction with the other interlocutors?

3. How does an L2 learner orient to learn L2 vocabulary and talk at the same time, and finally?

4. How can we claim that the learner actually developed vocabulary knowledge through talk-in-interaction and find evidence of learning over time?

---

[6] She refers to Markee's (2000) study as an exception of incipient evidence of L2 learning "in the short term." However, Hauser (2003) contends that what Markee (2000) demonstrated is opportunities for learning or conduct that could be associated with learning.

## DATA

The data for this study were collected in a conversation partner program, called "interchange" in an intensive English program at one of the universities in Hawai'i. As in other kinds of conversation partner programs or activities (cf., the "conversation club" described by Hauser, 2003; the *zadankai* in Mori, 2002; the *Gesprächsrunden* in Kasper, in press), it was launched to give L2 learners opportunities to meet target language speakers and improve their L2 (in this case, English) through conversation practice.

There are some distinct characteristics in this "interchange" program, which are different from other conversation partner activities. First, students meet their "interchangers" twice a week during "regular" oral production class time and have conversations with them on campus (e.g., in the cafeteria) rather than in the classroom. The conversation usually consists of one interchanger and two students, but sometimes a dyad or one interchanger with three students may occur situationally. The teacher assigns different interchangers to a different pair of students each time so that each student can have a chance to talk to everyone in the class. The teacher also provides a handout with possible topics for discussion varying from family, hobbies, and food to child raising, mid-wife education, and the Zodiac.

As a conversation partner, the role of interchangers is quite similar to other kinds of conversation partners ("interaction pivot" in Hauser, 2003; "interaction manager" in Kasper, in press) in the way that they manage the topics, ask questions of learners to keep the conversation going, and help students' L2 comprehension and production with different strategies. However, there is no strong obligation to follow the guidelines (i.e., handout topic), so anyone in the conversation can change the topic. Therefore, the conversation is very dynamic and diverse, depending on how the conversation participants co-construct the interaction on a moment-by-moment basis according to their orientations to the topics, roles, learning English, and so forth.

Throughout the six-week term, conversations of "Ok-son", who is a Korean student enrolled in a low-intermediate class in the intensive English program were audio-recorded, and each conversation lasted from 50 minutes to one hour.[7] At the time of the

---

[7] In the beginning of the term, the researcher, one of the interchangers, gathered consent forms from the

recording, it had been three months since Ok-son came to Hawaiʻi, and she had already attended one term in the program, so she knew the characteristics of the interchange very well. As an active and highly motivated English learner, she made a great effort to make local friends in order to learn English both inside and outside of the institution.[8] In total, 12 conversations were collected and transcribed according to the transcription convention described in the Appendix. In addition, to seek evidence of learning from the interchange sessions and its consequences over time, two conversations with the interchanger, Dan, who became friends with Ok-son and the researcher, were recorded three months after the last interchange.

### *L2 Learners' Self-initiation of Other Repair*

In the course of on-going talk, L2 learners often face problems in producing a word or phrase and seek help from the other interlocutors. Moreover, they have another agenda which is to learn new language through the talk. In this study, the scope of enquiry is limited to instances in which the L2 learner initiates repair when facing a vocabulary production problem, which is responded to and treated by the other interlocutor as an appeal for the supply of L2 vocabulary. In CA, repair refers to efforts to deal with any problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk, and consequently repair can be initiated by L2 learners in the process of word search to solve the problem in speaking. It should also be noted that the use of the same resource in a similar environment does not necessarily result in the same consequences, and when necessary, this will also be demonstrated.

*1) Formulaic expression – How can I say.* When the L2 learner is facing a production problem in the L2, s/he expresses difficulty by using a formulaic expression "how can I say." Brouwer (2003) called this kind of expression an "explicit word search marker" and demonstrated two different functions of it: one is a technique used to

---

students and interchangers in class. Since the researcher was one of the interchangers, recording was possible most of the time, and the researcher again asked for consent from the conversation group in which Ok-son was participating on the day of the recording.

[8] She attended many different activities in the local community, such as volunteering as a conversation partner for learners of Korean and going to the local church. She also tried to keep in touch with the interchangers who were helpful for her English study and who were her local friends.

produce a mutually recognized reference in otherwise problematic talk and the other is to request or invite help. In the current data, expressions such as "How can I say," and "How can I say the (word)", are distinguished from questions as in Brouwer's (2003) study and are formulaic devices to appeal for assistance and initiate repair. In the following excerpt, "how can I say" was used after the learner produced a candidate word and the interchanger provides the target vocabulary in the next turn.

```
Excerpt 1 (Tape 4/16 21:27 M: Mary, interchanger; I: Isao, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
01    I: Humid (.4) and wet.
02    (.5)
03    M: °O:[:::h°
04    I:    [Uncomfortable.
05 -> O: Ye::ah. [Usually: we::t.   [U::h hh (.2) how can I [say↓
06    I:         [mm…              A:[:: h                   [a::h
07       [we have to [bring,
08    M: [very::    [sticky?
09    O: Sticky?=
10    M: =Sticky.
11    O: A:::h.
12    I: A::h, sticky. We have to bri:ng, we: Always have to bri:ng
13       umbrella.
14    M: Oh, wow.
```

After Isao talks about the weather in Japan around June and July, Ok-son produces the agreement token "yeah" initiating her turn (line 5). In fact, prior to this segment, Ok-son and Isao talked about the similar weather in the summer in their own countries. After the agreement token, Ok-son produces "usually: we::t" with the elongated "wet," indicating her uncertainty of the word-choice "wet", compared to Isao's production of this word with emphasis in line 1. Also, it is followed by a prepositioned repair initiator "u::h" (Schegloff, 1979), an out-breath, and a pause (i.e., non-lexical perturbations: Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), indicating her word search and signaling the upcoming repair initiation. Then, Ok-son initiates repair with "how can I say." In line 8, Mary initiates her utterance by lengthening the sound in "very," in orientation to the fact that her turn is in overlap with Isao's utterance and maybe also to search for a word to supply. Then, she provides an alternative word "sticky" with rising intonation, which is

trymarking (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), signaling uncertainty and inviting a response from Ok-son whether it is what she was looking for. In the next turn, Ok-son repeats it with rising intonation, indicating that the word provided is new to her, and Mary confirms the word by repeating it with downward intonation. In line 11, Ok-son produces a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984), and Isao produces the same token with the provided word, indicating that both learners received the word as new information and claimed understanding of it. Isao resumes the talk by restating the utterance which was overlapped by Mary in line 7. Thus, Ok-son initiated repair when she was not sure of her word choice, and the expression "how can I say" displayed that she was seeking help from other interlocutors. The following excerpt also contains Ok-son's use of "how can I say", but there is no candidate word produced by the learner with uncertainty.

```
Excerpt 2 (Tape 5/29 12:37 K: Kyungmi, interchanger; K: Keiko, student, O: Ok-
    son, student)
01   O: O::::::h usually: my frie:nds↑, they have some eh some problems,
02      A:lways. .hh how hh ((with sigh)) what should I do::, How can
03      I:: (.) do: and so, I'm, .hh little bit I'm stressful. Ye:ah.=
04   K: =O:::h. [because SO::  many frie:nds ask you [about their=
05   O:      Al[l my friend.                        [Ye:::s.
06   K: =[proble:ms.
07 -> O: =[But I'm, my: situatio:n is (.) very: mm. How can I say. .hh
08      I [cannot,
09   K:   [Neutral.
10   O: Yeah=yeah=yeah=yeah.=
11   K: =Yeah. [Neutral.
12   O:        [Neutral. Only neutral. I   [have to neutral.
13   K:                               Ye: [ah.
14   O: .hhhh e:h so::, so many time I (.) confuse. A::h what should
15      I hh try hhh do. How can I say: .hh to my friend, and so.=
16   K: =Ye::ah.
```

Prior to this segment, the interchanger had read the characteristics of Ok-son's sign *Libra* in the Zodiac handout, saying that she must be good at arbitration. In line 7, after Ok-son self-repairs her utterance "I'm" to "my:," she orients to talk about her situation as an arbitrator. She displays her word-searching through perturbations and produces "how can I say" in the syntactic location for an adjective to describe her situation, which is not

responded to immediately. In line 9, Kyungmi supplies the word "neutral" in overlap with Ok-son's on-going utterance. Since Ok-son did not produce a candidate word in this case, Kyungmi seemed to orient to the prior turns (lines 1-6) and the beginning of the trouble source turn (line 7) to infer the trouble source so that she could provide the target word. Right after the word is provided, Ok-son receives it with multiple "yeah"s, strongly claiming her agreement with the proffered lexical item. Then, Kyungmi confirms it with a confirmation token and a repeat of the word, which is not usual in ordinary conversation. In this case, we can look at the interchanger Kyungmi's role orientation as a target language expert or language teacher, not only providing the target word (line 9) but also confirming it one more time (line 11). In line 12, Ok-son repeats the word and uses it in a larger unit: first, after an adverb, and second, in the utterance. In fact, the utterance is not grammatically correct since the copular "be" is missing. However, this demonstrates that Ok-son incorporates the provided word in a syntactic structure to continue the talk and practice the word at the same time. Also, Ok-son's previous knowledge of the word and form was exhibited; even though she could not retrieve the word, she could recognize it and displayed a strong claim of agreement to the provided lexical item. Through this talk, she had a chance to produce and practice this word in her utterances.[9] The following is another example of learner repair initiation in the on-going production to appeal for assistance, but the interaction is more complicated due to the participants' active involvement in the word search.

```
Excerpt 3 (Tape 6/12 7:21 J: Jim, interchanger; C: Chieko, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
01   C: =so:: (.5) we decided? Bu:t, my sister? My siste:r u::h(m) (1.2)
02      pick (.) the ca:t(.)s  [to:: my house?
03   O:                       Mm[mm
04 -> C: [She fou:nd u:hm how, °how can I say the°,
05   O: [°Mm°.
06   J: The: handicapped? (.2) or,
07   C: Or wild cat? No, no. [not wild.
```

---

[9] In fact, Ok-son initiated repair when she had trouble producing an adjective word. However, she seemed to use it as a verb ("I have to neutral"). In this case, it can be said that she has not fully acquired lexical knowledge in terms of the word category, and her lack of *grammatical competence* (Canale & Swain, 1980) could also impede her learning the word in use.

```
08   O:                           [Yeah, wild cat.
09   J: [Street?
10   C: [A:h,     Stree:t?
11   J: Street cat?
12   C: [Yeah. Street cat. Ye:ah.
13   O: [shee:
14   J: [Street cat.
15   O: [°shee:°     A:h [>stree(t)< a::h, [street cat.
16   C:                   [My siste:r,     [ye:ah.
17      My sister found a street ca:t, (.4) and she, he wa:s this, [this,
18   O:                                                      [A:::h=
19   J: =Ho:[:h.
20   O:      [Cu:te.
21   C: So:: cute.
```

Note that in line 4, Chieko initiates repair with "how can I say the," in a syntactic slot where one expects to hear the object of the verb "found." Again, there is no candidate solution produced by the learner in the same turn, but the interchanger provides the target word in the next turn by orienting to the prior turn of Chieko. In lines 1-2, Chieko displayed some difficulty in production, especially her uncertainty of the word choice "cats." Throughout the turns, Jim provides a word with rising intonation, checking her confirmation in lines 6, 9, and 11. First, Chieko does not accept the provided word as the right solution and produces her temporary solution "wild cat" (line 7), followed by her self-rejection in overlap with Ok-son's affirmation. This shows Chieko's partial knowledge of the lexical item she is trying to produce—at least, she knows it is not "wild cat." On the other hand, in line 8, Ok-son confirms "wild cat" to be the right choice, displaying her knowledge of the expression "wild cat." In line 12, Chieko receives "street cat" provided by Jim as a solution with the receipt token, the repetition of the word, and another receipt token, claiming her acceptance. At the same time, Ok-son is also orienting to learn the new lexical item which she could not recognize. In line 14, Jim confirms the target word with the repetition, orienting to his role as a language teacher and this is in overlap with Ok-son's another display of her difficulty in repeating the word correctly. However, the overlapped confirmation by Jim results in her immediate change-of-state token and the correct repeat. This demonstrates that the interchanger's role orientation by confirming the target word not only helped Chieko to get the target lexical item one more

time, but also helped Ok-son to learn a word. In line 17, Chieko resumes her talk by incorporating the provided word into her utterance without hesitation.

Sometimes the use of "how can I say" is not as clear as in the instances above. The above examples exhibit that "how can I say" was used to initiate repair, clearly displaying production problems and appealing for the supply of L2 vocabulary. However, there is some ambiguity as to whether it could have been used as *private speech*, talk which is apparently produced solely for the speaker him- or herself (Ohta, 2000, 2001). Hauser (2003) considered a segment a potential instance of *private speech* if it was produced "quietly, apparently received no response from other participants, and the lack of response was not treated as problematic" (p. 311). In all of the examples above, "how can I say" was produced with falling intonation or followed by a definite article to elicit the next word. Also, it was not produced in the manner of an L2 learner talking to him/herself, and in all of the cases, the appeals were responded to by the interchanger in the next turn. Let us look at the next excerpt which also has "how can I say" but the intonation is a bit different.

```
Excerpt 4 (Tape 5/15 20:01 J: Jamey, interchanger; C: Chieko, student; K: Katsu,
    student; O: Ok-son, student)
01    C: Mm, you have t- o:ne sister?
02    O: .hh sss, (1.4) siste:rs, elder siste:rs o:ne, (1.0) ah, (.8)
03        hhhh yeah sisters, (1.4) [three siste:rs
04    K:                          [How old is that sister?
05 -> O: ahaha three: older sister a:nd o:ne, (.7) hhhow can I say, °ah-°=
06    K: =[Younger [sister.
07    J: =[Younger [sister.
08    C:          [°Yeah, younger°,
09    O:          [Young, younger sister, ye:ah.
10    J: [O::h you have five girls.
11    C: [O::h three sisters.    Eh?
12    O: yeah, but (.5) a::hm, nowadays we li:ve, just(e::) my younger sister
13       and I: and my parents.
14    C: O:::h.=
```

Chieko asks Ok-son if she has one sister, whom she talked about prior to this conversation. Ok-son's answer in line 2 is delayed by some perturbations. She, then, takes the turn and produces "elder siste:rs o:ne", followed by a (1.0) pause. It is not clear

from the context if she oriented to say she has "one elder sister" or "elder sisters and one brother or younger sister." In line 3, Ok-son's utterance is in over lap with Katsu's question, indicating that he understood Ok-son's utterance in line 2 as she has "one elder sister," despite the wrong plural form. Then, Ok-son repairs her previous utterance and this is followed by the stretched "a:nd o:ne", a (.7) pause, and "how can I say, °ah-°". Here, what is different from the previous examples is that it was not produced with falling intonation, and it was followed by °ah-°, the hearable indication of her difficulty. In lines 6-7, Katsu and the interchanger simultaneously provide the word, and Chieko and Ok-son receive it simultaneously. Therefore, this excerpt demonstrates another form of "how can I say" and shows how participants orient to the repair sequences collaboratively so that Ok-son's vocabulary problem could be solved.[10] In the end, Ok-son continues her talk by incorporating the target lexical item in her utterance.

    *2) Code-switching.* In conversations in which second/foreign languages are involved, there are always chances of switching from L2 to L1. In the current CA studies, code-switching has been found to be used in different ways. Hauser (2003) observed that L2 learners use their L1 as a resource to seek help from another learner when s/he shares the same L1. In Markee's (2000) study, a learner translated an L2 word into the L1 to demonstrate his understanding of the word. More recently, in the study of native and nonnative participants' shifting orientations to the activity, membership categories, and participant statues, and its implications in L2 learning, Kasper (in press) observed that code-switches by an L2 learner indexed "the shifts from conversation to a language learning event." Code-switching in the current study, though, is used to indicate the lexical problems and the other interlocutors respond to it by providing an L2 target word, instead of a "target language format" (Kasper, in press). In the following excerpt, the learner produces the target lexical item in her L1, Korean and the interchanger provides the target word in the next turn. It is interesting to focus on the interactional move toward the word search (i.e., the sequential organization of the talk made it relevant for Ok-son

---

[10] In fact, Ok-son receives the target word as if she is constructing the word "young" with a comparative "-er". It is highly likely that she already knew the word "young" but could not match it with "younger" in terms of "younger sister." Considering also that "young" is quite a basic and frequently used word, her problem may be related to a transfer from her L1, Korean. In Korean, there are two separate words for "older sister" and "younger sister," while in English, those two words are distinguished by a change in the modifying adjective. Hence, the English calling system for "sisters" may not be familiar to her.

to talk more about her hobby and face the vocabulary problem as its consequence).


```
Excerpt 5 (Tape 4/16 6:42 M: Mary, interchanger; O: Ok-son, student; I: Isao,
    student)
01    M: How about uh hobbi:es and interests.
02    (1.7)
03    M: Hobbies.=
04    I: =Interest.
05    M: Hobbies and interests. Do you have any hobbi:es?=
06    O: =Mm…=
07    I: =Ye:::ahmm. (1.1) °(you-)°
08    O: ((tsp)) .hh I: like u::h classical music↑
09    (2.5)
10    M: Do you:: play classical instruments?
11    O: mm just listening. hehehe .hh=
12    M: =O:h.
13    (1.7)
14    M:°classical music?°
15    (1.1)
16    O: Listen.(1.2) And, and u:::h ((I coughs)) I, u:h classical
17       music CD?
18    M: Mm-hm.=
19 -> O: =I'm u::h muoji? ((what is it?)) sujip. ((collect))
20       (1.1) A:::h=
21    M: =Co[llect.    [Collect.
22    O:    [Collect. [I: collect.=
23    I: =Ah-hah.
24    (.5)
25    O: Collect.=
26    M: =°O:::h. Oka:y. °
27    O: °Yeah°.
28    M: have any other hobbies, or interests?
```


To a question in line 5, Ok-son produces an insufficient answer and in line 9, a rather long (2.5) pause follows. In line 10, Mary asks another question, indicating her role orientation to interaction manager, to elicit more information from Ok-son. Following Ok-son's additional answer, Mary produces a free-standing form of "oh", indicating that more of an account is not provided (Heritage, 1984). Then, a rather long (1.7) pause follows in which either Isao or Ok-son can take the turn. However, what follows is, again,

Mary's "classical music?" in a soft voice. Here, her utterance produced after the transition space is very important in the way that it indicates that the topic is not finished yet and that more elaboration is anticipated. In lines 16-17, Ok-son takes the turn and displays her word search. After "I" and a hesitation token, she produces a new topic "classical music CD?" without the verb. In line 19, following "I'm" and a hesitation token, she asks herself *muoji?* ("what is it?") in her L1, followed by *sujip*, a Korean word for "collecting". As it turns out, the other participants do not share the same L1 or understand Korean, but Ok-son clearly identifies the trouble source word in Korean. At this moment, it is not clear if Ok-son knows the verb and cannot remember it, or does not know the verb in English at all. In line 21, Mary provides "collect" and right after the beginning sound "co-," Ok-son immediately produces the same word "collect," indicating that Ok-son knew the word but could not retrieve it. This also indicates that Mary could infer the target word based on the context despite her lack of knowledge in Korean. Ok-son incorporates the provided target word in her utterance, but this time, without the object. The missing object may be because Ok-son produced the topic earlier in the prior turn (line 16-17) and omitted it in the next utterance. After Isao's immediate receipt token, the topic is hearably closed. However, in line 25, Ok-son produces the word "collect" in the full turn, which demonstrates her orientation to practicing the word as a learner. Thus, this excerpt exhibits the interactional move toward the word search, mainly resulting from the interchanger's role orientation as an interaction manager. Also, Ok-son's code-switching was to identify the target word in her L1, and this is treated as the learner's initiation of repair. In excerpt 6, Ok-son's announced word search again contains a Korean word although no one actually understands Korean. However, this time, repair is not completed in the next turn and delayed until the participants reach the mutual understanding of the talk. The participants are talking about Ok-son's experience in Osaka, Japan, where the other two learners are from.

```
Excerpt 6 (Tape 5/15 23:51 J: Jamey, interchanger, C: Chieko, student; K: Katsu,
    student; O: Ok-son, student)
01   C: [Where-, where did you [live?
02   J:                        [Boring.
03   O: .hhhh I don't remembe:r bu:t near the: the bi:::g (.) crab? (1.2)
04      [the restaurant?
```

```
05    C: [O:::h
06    O: Near the: Shinsaibashi. You know Shinsaiba[shi:?
07    C:                                          [Yeah yeah. I know
08       Shinsaibashi
09    O: But I don't kno:w the exactly the °sh-° e:h locatio:n or but
10 ->    nea:r Shinsaibashi: a:nd so, .hh (.9) bi:g crab? Hhhow can I say Ge,
11 ->    ge, ge. ((crab)).
12    K: hehe
13 -> O: Ge. ((crab))
14    (1.0)
15    C: Big tower? (.7) No?
16 -> O: Ge. ((crab)) (1.3) A::h I don't know. hh .hh And so, (1.7)
17       it's sea:: u::h sea:: anima(l)-
18    (.8)
19    J: Really.
20    C: Kani-=
21    K: =A::h [Kani,
22    O:       [ye:ah,   [Kane?=
23    C:               O::[::h=
24    K: =Kanidoora[ku.
25    C:           [Crab? Crab. yeah=yeah=yeah. Near Kanidoora[(ku).
26    O:                                                    [and maybe
27       it's [to:y.
```

To Chieko's question in line 1, Ok-son answers with "near the big crab?", displaying her uncertainty of the word choice "crab" and inviting responses from the other interlocutors. Following a pause, she produces "the restaurant?" in overlap with Chieko's free-standing "oh." Here, Ok-son is trying to indicate "the restaurant" to provide some information about where she lived in Japan, which is in some way related to the "big crab."[11] In line 10, Ok-son indicates some place name and again produces the word "bi:g crab?", going back to the previous trouble source. This is immediately followed by her word search using a Korean word ("how can I say *ge*, *ge*, *ge*."). Note that in line 13 and 16, her L1 word is produced regardless of the other participants' responses and this clearly demonstrates that, again, she is targeting the trouble source in Korean. In line 16, following a rather long pause (1.3), she seems to abort her word search, but after some

---

[11] It turned out that the restaurant she remembered has a hanging 'fake crab' in front of the building which is the symbol of the restaurant. The participants talk about this later in the conversation after they figure out what Ok-son was referring to.

hesitation, she paraphrases the word "*ge*" as "a sea animal." Then, Chieko and Katsu

display their recognition of the place. In line 24, Katsu produces the whole area name, of

which the last syllable is overlapped with Chieko's "crab" with a rising intonation,

followed by her repeat with a falling intonation. This excerpt demonstrates the

collaborative achievement of mutual understanding among the learners. Chieko did not

recognize the target word (lines 3 and 10) and guessed the wrong thing (line 15), but once

she understands the location, she remembers what Ok-son said before and recognizes it.

Ok-son's L1 word did not elicit the correct response immediately, but it was the main

source for the word search and the other interlocutors treated it as her self-initiated repair.

Other than the above examples, there were more segments which contained Ok-son's

code-switching in the study, and most of them were found in the one-on-one conversation

with the interchanger Kyungmi. The following excerpt exemplifies that Kyungmi can

provide the target lexical item based on Ok-son's L1 word.

```
Excerpt 7 (Tape 10/7 16:45 K: Kyungmi, former-interchanger; O: Ok-son, student)
01    O: A::h we always (.8) ye:ah tried to be: hone:st and tried to be:
02 ->    (1.9) pujiro:n hago, pu[jiron,((diligent))
03    K:                         [Diligent.=
04    O: =a:h diligent. .hh Ye:ah. Sti:ll, .hhhh I'm sure I'm very:
05        dilige:nt and honest person.
06    (.7)
07    K: O:h I see. [That's very good.
08    O:           [Yeah.        Yeah.
09    K: Mm-hm.
```

In line 2, after a pause, Ok-son code-switches to Korean in a location for an adjective,

and Kyungmi provides the L2 equivalent word in the next turn. In lines 4-5, Ok-son

receives it with the change-of-state token and the repetition of the proffered word. Then,

she incorporates it into her utterance. Compared to the previous excerpts in which the

supply of the target word or the confirmation was delayed after a rather long pause or

exchanging more turns, Kyungmi provides the word immediately. In fact, without a

candidate word and without understanding the Korean word, it is fairly difficult to infer

the word. Also, even though there is some context in line 1, it is not clear what Ok-son is

trying to say after the pause. In this case, Kyungmi, who is also Korean, displayed her

knowledge of Korean by providing the target lexical item in the next turn of the trouble
source turn.

  *3) Similar sounding words.* In this study, two examples of Ok-son's using a similar
sounding word which shares not only phonological but also semantic features with the
target word were found. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) noted that L2 learners use a lexical
item which sounds more or less like the target item and also "a single alternative lexical
item, such as a superordinate or a related term, which shares semantic features with the
target word or structure" (p. 188). Both strategies are included in their inventory of
strategic language devices and the latter strategy is called *approximation.*

  In the following excerpt, the use of this resource emerges after trying some candidate
solution words and it was found to be used to initiate repair while searching for a word.
The following is from a conversation where Ok-son talks about her favorite movie
"Thelma and Louise."

```
Excerpt 8 (Tape 3/25 M: Mayumi, interchanger; E: Emiko, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
01   O: Maybe suspense. [It(')s, .hh yeah. (.9) yeah. subject? subject?
02   M:                 [↓mm.
03   (1.2)
04   O: is very::, (.7) ↓yea:h. too: (.) ha:rd.
05   (2.2)
06   M: °Mm°.
07   O: °Chuje.° ((Korean for topic, subject, or theme)) .hh
08      ((strong in-breath)) yeah.
09   M: [Mm.
10   O: [but, mm.=
11   M: =se, serious topic? (.7) I I I I mean the=
12 -> O: =the tem.
13   (.9)
14   O: The tem? tem?
15   (1.1)
16   O: tem?=
17   M: =tem?
18   (1.0)
19   O: Subject? It(')s mai::n, main ide(a) main thinking.
20   M: [↓Mm.
21   O: [It(')s, movi:e of main thinking is .hh very difficult.
```

```
22    M: Mm...[mm↑
23    O:     [understand?
24    M: typica::l like,
25    (.9)
26    O: Yeah. °It(')s, (.) yeah.°
27    M: °Okay.° How does the, how does the story go:es like, there's the,
28    O: ↓Yeah.
```

In line 1, Ok-son's word search is evident in an in-breath, a turn-medial "yeah," a pause, and another turn-medial "yeah."[12] Then, she initiates repair by producing a candidate word with rising intonation twice, indicating her uncertainty of the word-choice "subject" and seeking the other participant's help. What follows is a (1.2) pause and in line 4, she continues her utterance with some hesitation.[13] Then, a long (2.2) pause follows and Mayumi indicates that Ok-son's utterance was not fully taken by her with a minimum response "mm" in a soft voice. In line 7, Ok-son code-switches to the Korean word *Chuje* ('topic,' 'subject,' or 'theme,' etc., depending on the context), identifying the target word in Korean and closes her turn.[14] Ok-son seems to abort her word search in

---

[12] In line 1, Ok-son produces an in-breath, followed by "yeah", a (.9) pause, and another "yeah." Wong (2000a) studied the different uses of "yeah" in nonnative discourse with native speakers and found that nonnative speakers produce disfluencies (cutoff, sound stretches, "uh" etc.) that are followed by the token "yeah" in self-initiated repair. More specifically, the turn-medial "yeah" is preceded by repair initiation signals (cutoff, sound stretches, "uh" etc.) and followed by a fluent utterance, indicating that at the moment of "yeah," the search has ended, concluded, or terminated, and what follows is effective, successful repair or no repair at all. However, Wong found one deviant case where "yeah" is followed by further repair. In this case, "yeah" is produced after the announced search "how can I say," and she said that this "yeah" is produced "prematurely" when the speaker has not yet fully worked out the result of the search. Note that in the current data, in line 1, the first turn-medial "yeah" is preceded by a repair initiation signal (an in-breath), but it is followed by a pause and another "yeah". Then, it is followed by repair initiation. Ok-son produces the word "subject" as a word search result but repeats it with a rising intonation two times, seeking confirmation from the other interlocutors. It could be that "yeah" was produced prematurely twice, but in this case, it is more likely that "yeah" is used as a filled pause or a hesitation token, searching for a word and displaying difficulty in producing the next word, which is followed by repair initiation.

However, Wong (2000a) mentioned that the use of "yeah" in her study was only produced by one speaker, and it could be idiosyncratic. Therefore, more research on the different uses of tokens such as "yeah" in nonnative discourse will be necessary.

[13] In fact this is the case demonstrated by Wong (2000a). Following the stretched sound in "very", a (.7) second pause (repair initiation indicators), and "yeah," Ok-son produces a candidate lexical item. This demonstrates that Ok-son entered into a search for the next word, and at the moment "yeah" she produced, her searching ended, and no repair ensued.

[14] As can be seen, this is another example of *code-switching.* The use is quite similar in that it provides the target word in the L1 and the supply of the target word is not followed immediately since no one in the conversation understands Korean.

line 10, but Mayumi immediately takes the turn and guesses what Ok-son is seeking, resulting in a (.7) pause and Mayumi's self-repair initiation. Then, Ok-son immediately produces a word "the tem" which sounds similar and shares semantic features with the target word "theme," in this case. Following a pause, she initiates repair by repeating the same word with a rising intonation twice, which is again followed by a rather long (1.1) pause. With no response or attempt for repair completion, in line 16, Ok-son repeats the word "tem" with a rising intonation one more time. In lin2 17, the interchanger displays her uncertainty of the word and after a pause, Ok-son abandons the unsuccessful word choice "tem" and replaces it with the already produced word "subject". Then, she immediately self-repairs it to "main idea, main thinking," the definition of "subject" or "theme." This time, it is received and confirmed by the interchanger. In line 21, Ok-son paraphrases the previous utterance "it(')s subject is too hard" to "it(')s movie of main thinking is very difficult," using the confirmed expression and making the utterance more complex, although the subject phrase is grammatically in error.[15] In fact, Mayumi does not demonstrate or claim her understanding of Ok-son's utterance, and in line 23, she changes the topic to the movie story. In this case, the similar sounding word did not elicit the target word, but the analysis offered an alternative account to *approximation* as evidence of learner's "intentions" or "potential cognitive plans" as "strategies" (Faerch & Kasper, 1983a).

In the same conversation, there is another example of Ok-son's use of a similar sounding word to initiate repair while searching for a word. However, this time, it elicits the interchanger's supply of the target lexical item.

```
Excerpt 9 (Tape 3/25 M: Mayumi, interchanger; E: Emiko, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
48    O: and so::, (.8) uh hehe .hh end of, (.8) both a::(re) (.) dead.
49    (1.4)
50 -> O: Suseid? Shuseid?
51    (1.5)
```

---

[15] It is also noticeable that Ok-son displays different syntactic constructions and word choice before and after exchanging turns and doing repairs with the interchanger. Studies on how L2 learners develop *syntax* out of interactional sequences, turn takings, and participants' role orientations will be insightful to understand L2 *development* through conversation.

```
52 -> O: °Suseid°?
53     (.9)
54     O: °Shhh shhh° [eh-=
55     M:             [SUICIDE.=
56     O: =SUICIDE.
57     M: [A::::H.
58     O: [°a:::h° (.) and:,
59     M: both of them? ((In a high pitch))
60     O: Yeah. ((Lightly))
61     M: both of,
62     O: Ye:ahh=
63     M: =Suicide, [o:::h
64     O:           [And drive and (.) yeah.
```

Prior to this segment, Ok-son talked about the movie's story, but in line 48, she displays difficulty in producing the next utterance.[16] Then, she jumps to the end of the movie and produces "both a::(re)," stretching the second word, and a micro-pause, indicating her word search. This is followed by "dead," produced with a final intonation and without any indications that this word is problematic. At this point, the word search is hearably and successfully complete. Then, a rather long (1.4) pause follows and in the next turn, she initiates self-repair with a similar sounding word "suseid?" and a slightly different form "shuseid?" with decreased volume. This self-repair, though, gets no response from Mayumi, resulting in the (1.5) pause. In line 52, Ok-son reinitiates repair with increased uncertainty over the first word by saying it quietly. There is again no response, resulting in the (.9) pause, leading Ok-son to reinitiate repair once more in line 54. Then, in line 55, Mayumi provides the word "SUICIDE" in a loud voice, which Ok-son repeats in the following turn in a loud voice with a latch, confirming that it was what she was seeking. In line 57, Mayumi produces a change-of-state token, claiming her understanding of what Ok-son was trying to say and the actual event in the movie. At the same time, Ok-son produces change-of-state token, acknowledging her receipt of new information and claiming again from not knowing the word "suicide" to knowing it.

---

[16] In the case of laughing, it is not uncommon for people to produce brief laughter when they are facing some kind of trouble in the interaction which they take themselves to be the source of. Note also that Mayumi apparently does not take this laughter as an invitation for her to join the laughter. Thank Hauser for this comment.

So far, it has been demonstrated how L2 learners self-initiate repair through different resources and how their co-participants complete the repair by providing the word in orientation to their role as a target language expert or language teacher. However, since the participants resumed the talk once the repair was completed, it was very difficult to find instances of the use of the provided word again in the same conversation, unless they went back to the previous topic.[17] In this study, to trace L2 vocabulary development over time, two more conversations with Ok-son and her former interchangers Dan and Kyungmi were collected three months after the last interchange.[18]

### *Ok-son's L2 Vocabulary Development*

There were three examples of Ok-son's use of a word obtained through the repair sequences in the previous conversation found in a later conversation with the former interchanger Kyungmi. In this section, Ok-son's lexical development will be demonstrated by comparing the previous instance in which Ok-son initiated repair facing a word production problem with the later one in which she uses the word without any indication of hesitation. To do this, the relevant previous excerpts will be provided so that comparison of the different instances of the vocabulary use over time will be easier.

*1. Collect.* The participants were talking about hobbies and Ok-son was answering a question about her hobbies.

---

[17] Hatch (1978) pointed out that it is possible that adult learners only elicit new vocabulary in order to *participate* on a moment-by-moment basis in a conversation.

[18] Since Ok-son transferred to another institution in Hawai'i, the later two conversations were not conducted as regular interchange sessions. However, these two conversations were not prescheduled or preplanned for data collection and were highly similar to a one-on-one interchange. In particular, the conversation with Kyungmi became the primary source for the investigation of the later use of the target vocabulary from the previous interchange sessions. It is because Ok-son was preparing for a job interview and requested Kyungmi to help her prepare. Ok-son brought a list of possible questions from a website for oral interviews, and those questions turned out to be identical to the questions used in the interchange sessions, such as hobbies, family, and hometown, etc. The talk mainly consisted of Kyungmi's questions and Ok-son's answers, and some comments or advice were inserted between different topics. Considering that she sometimes had one-on-one conversations in the regular interchange sessions and the format of the talk consisted of questions and answers predominantly, this conversation has quite similar characteristics with the interchange.

```
Excerpt 10 (Tape 4/16 6:42 M: Mary, interchanger; O: Ok-son, student; I: Isao,
   student)
16    O: Listen.(1.2) And, and u:::h ((I coughs)) I, u:h classical
17       music CD?
18    M: Mm-hm.=
19 -> O: =I'm u::h muoji? ((what is it?)) sujip. ((collect))
20       (1.1) A:::h=
21    M: =Co[llect.    [Collect.
22    O:    [Collect.  [I: collect.=
23    I: =Ah-hah.
24       (.5)
25    O: Collect.=
26    M: =°O:::h. Oka:y. °
```

In this excerpt, she could not retrieve the word and produced a subject and an object first,
omitting the verb. Then, she produced a Korean word for "collecting" and Mary provided
the target word in English based on the context. After obtaining the verb, Ok-son
incorporated it into the context and also produced only the target word to practice it. The
later conversation which contains the same word is from a conversation with Kyungmi,
when two of them talk about Ok-son's hobbies again.

```
Excerpt 11 (Tape 10/7 5:20 K: Kyungmi, former interchanger; O: Ok-son, student)
01    K: Oh, okay. (.) Ye:ah. (1.0) (O)kay? A::hm, (1.3) wha:t (.) are your
02       outside interests.
03    O: Outside interest? .hh That means hobby?=like the::…
04    K: Yeah. I think so.=
05    O: =Ye:ah. .hhhh A:h I like the, (1.6) °outside (interest)°
06       A:h I like the: music.
07    K: ↓mm.=
08    O: =Kind of, especially classical music [so:  (1.1) a:::hm,
09    K:                                      [°Mm-hm°
10 -> O: I like to collect the: (.9) class- uh specia::l classical (.)
11       u:h CD. [Compact disk.=
12    K:         [mm-hm
13       =mm-hm.
14    O: a:h (.) .hh ah mm. hhh okay. .hh hh .hhhh ((one clap sound))
15 ->    I, .hh I collect the: uh classical CD, (1.2) CD. So I have, (.9)
16       ove:r one hundred CD, (.) in my ho(me), in my room.
17    K: O:::h [wow.
18    O:      [Yeah.
```

Kyungmi asks a new question from the question list to Ok-son about her "outside interest," which was "hobbies" in the previous episode. After Ok-son's repair initiation and Kyungmi's confirmation (lines 3-4), Ok-son displays some difficulty in answering immediately. In line 6, she initiates her answer and she clarifies that she likes classical music (line 8), followed by displays of her difficulty in production. Then, in lines 10-11, she produces the whole utterance as an answer. Note here that she uses the word "collect" in the appropriate context fluently and without any hesitation in use. This time, her utterance demonstrates that she uses the word "collect" as a transitive verb correctly. In line 15, she uses the word again as a transitive verb ("I collect the: uh classical CD.") without any problem.[19] Therefore, she clearly manifests that she has developed her knowledge of "collect" and can use it in a fluent manner in a more complex structure.

*2. Suicide.* In the previous excerpt, Ok-son talked about the movie "Thelma and Louise" and initiated repair with a similar sounding word to elicit the target word from the other participants.

```
Excerpt 12 (Tape 3/25 M: Mayumi, interchanger; E: Emiko, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
48   O: and so::, (.8) uh hehe .hh end of, (.8) both a::(re) (.) dead.
49   (1.4)
50 -> O: Suseid? Shuseid?
51   (1.5)
52 -> O: °Suseid°?
53   (.9)
54   O: °Shhh shhh° [eh-=
55   M:             [SUICIDE.=
56   O: =SUICIDE.
57   M: [A::::H.
58   O: [°a:::h° (.) and:,
59   M: both of them? ((In a high pitch))
60   O: Yeah. ((Lightly))
61   M: both of,
```

---

[19] Compared to excerpt 10, she seems to have some difficulty in producing the object, though. In line 10, she displays her word searching and self-initiated repair. In line 15, she, again, displays some difficulty in producing the object with a stretching sound and a token "uh." Then, after producing "classical CD," she pauses for 1.2 seconds and repeats it with a falling intonation to close the turn. In the previous excerpt, she produced "classical music CD" which is different from "classical CD," and according to the context, the former is more appropriate.

```
62    O: Ye:ahh=
63    M: =Suicide, [o:::h
64    O:           [And drive and (.) yeah.
```

After Ok-son attempted to produce the target word with different forms of a similar sounding word, the interchanger provided the word based on the candidate words and the context. However, there was no confirmation of the target word as in the other excerpts nor was there language instruction about how to use the word "suicide," for example "commit suicide" or "kill oneself." The following is from the later conversation with Kyungmi again.

```
Excerpt 13 (Tape 10/7 36:48 K: Kyungmi, former interchanger, O: Ok-son,
   student)
01    O: Yeah, the characte:r (.) is about a woman.
02    K: mm-hm.
03    O: Thelma: and Louise? .hhhh the two woman('s) the character is
04       the opposi:te↑
05    K: mm-hm.=
06    O: =.hh hh .hh I think Thelma an very tough gi:rl. The Louise is very
07       soft gi:rl. .hhhh so, (1.2) they? (1.3) .hh but (.) u:hhh (.6) .hh
08       the: the start of the movie: wa:s eh two woman, (2.2) go to the:
09       tri:(p)?
10    K: Trip?
11    O: ye:ah. (2.7) ((She expresses difficulty in explaining the story in
12       Korean to Kyungmi))
13       Okay. (1.5) .hh a:hm (.8) if you:: see the movie you ca:n see the,
14       (.7) you can fee:l (.) the movie's, ah- you can fee:l .hh (2.2)
15       the, (2.1) the end of the movi:e, the (.) two woman will u:h two
16 ->    woman decide suəsai:d. B[ut, instead of tha:t, I think it's not,
17    K:                        [mm.
18    (.6)
19 -> O: fail. I think (.) the suəsaid i:s (.) the: they:, (1.1) they:
20       (.) gonna be wi:n.
```

After Ok-son talks about the two characters and the beginning part of the movie (lines 1-9), she expresses her difficulty in explaining the story to Kyungmi who shares the same L1 (lines 11-12). Then, in line 13, after a boundary marker "Okay" (Schiffrin, 1987), Ok-son orients to continue her talk with a different starting point, but in lines 15-16, she

jumps to the end part of the movie again as before. Here, the comparison of her sentence with the previous one explaining the same story demonstrates the difference quite well. The expressions "end of," "both" "a::(re) (.) dead" from the previous interchange are changed to "the end of the movie," "two woman," "decide s̲u̲əsai:d," respectively. Focusing on the word "suicide," the pronunciation of "suicide" is changed from [suseid] and [ʃuseid] to [s̲u̲əsaid] which is more target-like and does not result in an initiation of any kind of repair. She uses the word "suicide" with the verb "decide" without any indication of hesitation or lack of certainty. It could be used as either an object of the verb, that is, a noun or an infinitive without "to." In line 19, we can find the word again, and this time it is obviously used as a noun and a subject in a noun clause. However, whether Ok-son's use of "suicide" here resulted from the previous interchange is still ambiguous. What can be said is that her similar sounding word in the previous interchange indicates that Ok-son had some partial knowledge of the word, (i.e., some knowledge of the word form and meaning), and about six months later, she uses the word in the right context with target-like pronunciation. Thus, this demonstrates that her vocabulary knowledge of the word "suicide" has been developed over time.

*3. Younger sister.* In the case of this word, there were three consecutive instances of Ok-son's learning "younger sister." The following excerpt is the first instance of Ok-son's display of her difficulty in producing the word "younger sister."

```
Excerpt 14 (Tape 4/16, 1:36 M: Mary, interchanger; I: Isao, student; O: Ok-son,
   student)
01    M: How big is your family.
02    O: hhhhehe .hh I have hehe many::: hehe .hhh I have many:: (1.3) hh
03       .hh sister. hehe I have   four sister.
04    I:                       ma-
05       Oh.
06    M: Wow.
07    (1.7)
08 -> O: and one hh .hh (.3) ah fo:ur el, elder sister and one- (.3) ah,
09       four older sister and one elder sister. (.8) Only sister. hehe
10    (.7)
11    M: Oh, so four older sisters and one younger?
12    O: one younger a:nd uh [fo:ur older.
13    M:                     [Yeah.     Older. Yeah.
```

```
14    I: A:::h…
15    M: Oh wow.
16    O: Yeah.=
```

This excerpt is striking in the way that it indicates that Ok-son's difficulty in producing the word "younger" in excerpt 4 was not the first time. To Mary's question in line 1, Ok-son answers with laughter and states that she has four sisters, which is followed by Isao's and Mary's receipts. Then, a (1.7) pause follows; the talk seems to be hearably closed. However, in line 8, Ok-son continues her utterance with "and one," and displays her word search and difficulty. Then, she orients to repair her answer, and after "four elder sister and one" with a cutoff, a pause follows, which clearly indicates her production problem. Following a change-of-state token, she self-repairs the phrase four "elder" to four "older," produces one "elder" sister, resulting in a pause, and closes the talk. Then, after a transition space in line 10, Mary produces an "oh" prefaced response, indicating that the previous answer is inappropriate (Heritage, 1998) and initiates other-initiated correction by repeating Ok-son's answer with the correct forms. In line 12, Ok-son receives the corrected word with the repetition "one younger" and "four older," which is overlapped with Mary's confirmation. In this excerpt, it is clearly demonstrated that Ok-son was confused with the word "older" and "elder," a commonly observable phenomenon in the nonnative discourse, and could not produce "younger" at first. With the interchanger's help, she finally produces "one younger." The following excerpt is excerpt 4 which demonstrated her display of difficulty in producing "younger sister" before.

```
Excerpt 15 (Tape 5/15 20:01 J: Jamey, interchanger; C: Chieko, student; K:
   Katsu, student; O: Ok-son, student)
01    C: Mm, you have t- o:ne sister?
02    O: .hh sss, (1.4) siste:rs, elder siste:rs o:ne, (1.0) ah, (.8)
03       hhhh yeah sisters, (1.4) [three siste:rs
04    K:                          [How old is that sister?
05 -> O: ahaha three: older sister a:nd o:ne, (.7) hhhow can I say, °ah-°=
06    K: =[Younger [sister.
07    J: =[Younger [sister.
08    C:          [°Yeah, younger°,
09    O:          [Young, younger sister, ye:ah.
```

```
10    J: [O::h you have five girls.
11    C: [O::h three sisters.        Eh?
12    O: yeah, but (.5) a::hm, nowadays we li:ve, just(e::) my younger sister
13       and I: and my parents.
14    C: O:::h.=
```

In line 2, Ok-son stops after "o:ne" and a (1.0) pause follows. Again, in line 5, after she produces "three older sister" and "one," a (.7) pause and her display of difficulty follow. In fact, in comparison with the previous excerpt in which Ok-son produced "elder" as "younger," in this excerpt, she does not produce a word after "one" and appeals for assistance. In this case, it demonstrates that she has not developed the lexical item fully from the previous conversation in terms of production. Now, here is the last instance where Ok-son uses this word after five months.[20]

```
Excerpt 16 (Tape 10/7, 0:16 K: Kyungmi, former interchanger; O: Ok-son,
student)
01    R: Okay. How many family members are there in your family. (.7)
02       Who are they.
03    (2.1)
04    O: My [f]arents? and I have (.) u:h fi:ve sisters. It's (.5)
05 -> ye:ah. (1.0) fo:ur older siste::r, and one younger sister.
06    R: Wo::w [(( ))
07    O:          [I'm, (.4) I'm the fifth.
08    R: O::h you have alotta:::,
09    O: yeah. °my°=
10    R: =sisters.=
11    O: =Y:es.
```

Kyungmi reads the question on the list, and in line 4, Ok-son answers the question. After displaying the word search, she clarifies her five sisters and produces "four older sister" and "one younger sister." Even though the plural form is still in error, she correctly produces "younger sister" without any indication of hesitation or uncertainty. Therefore,

---

[20] In fact, Ok-son's description of her sisters is different from the previous excerpt. She said that she had four older sisters and one younger sister, but later, she mentions that she has three older sisters and one younger sister. Later, it turns out that she has four older sisters in the data.

Ok-son's development of this word knowledge has been demonstrated through three different excerpts over time.

Therefore, Ok-son's L2 vocabulary development was demonstrated by tracing her conversations and comparing the previous episodes of repair sequences when facing the lexical problems, to the later uses of the target lexical item; she at first could not produce the target lexical item and displayed incomplete or partial knowledge and then manifested her learning through a more effective use of the words later.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study attempted to demonstrate the language learning opportunities in interactions through the micro-analytic framework of CA. As Markee (2000) noted, "an analysis of sequential organizations can potentially demonstrate whether and how participants exploit repair, on a moment-by-moment basis, as a resource for learning new language." I will now summarize how the research questions have been answered and consider the implications of this study for CA as an approach to SLA.

### RQ1- L2 Learner's Self-initiated Repair: How an L2 learner initiates repair (i.e., what kinds of resources are used for the learner's self-initiated repair) when facing an L2 vocabulary problem

When confronting difficulty in producing an L2 word or uncertainty with a word-choice, the learner initiated repair by means of three resources.

*1. The formulaic expression – "How can I say":* This expression was used to display the learner's difficulty with an L2 vocabulary problem *directly* so that in the next turn, the interchangers or the other learners could respond to it by supplying the target word or proffering a candidate solution word. In one case (excerpt 4), "how can I say" was used differently from the other examples in terms of the intonation, but it was demonstrated that the participants all oriented to the repair sequences by responding to it.

*2. Code-switching:* Occasionally, the L2 learner used an L1 word, even when the co-participants were not able to understand it. In these instances, the learner was searching for an L2 word by producing the L1 word, as well as targeting the trouble source. That is,

even though the co-participants could not understand what the trouble source was, the L1 word indexes that word searching is underway, and thereby appeals to the other participants to guess or provide the target word based on the context, treating the code-switches as self-initiated repair. It is quite similar to Kasper's (in press) study in terms of its role in the interactional sequence, despite the different objects of repair (L1 word vs. L1 version of trouble action).

*3. Similar sounding word:* The use of this resource offered an alternative account to *approximation* found in the communication strategies. In the current study, it was found that the learner used a similar sounding word to initiate repair while searching for a word. Ok-son not only uses a similar sounding word to search for a word but also uses it to indicate uncertainty of the word with trymarking and repeating it several times. In addition, this demonstrates that the learner has partial knowledge of the target lexical item in terms of the phonological and semantic features.

In the repair sequences, the repair initiation occurred in a very systematic way. The location of the use of the resources (i.e., repair initiator) was either (a) after an uncertain candidate solution (i.e., trouble source) or (b) in a location of a trouble source. In addition, the L2 learner's use of the resources to initiate repair is not only to deal with production problems in the talk, but also to display and construct their identities as L2 learners in the interaction (Kasper, in press; Mori, 2002; Wong, 2000b).

### RQ2 - Interchanger's Other-completed Repair: How the repair sequences are accomplished through talk-in-interaction with the other interlocutors

Hauser (2003) observed that a clear orientation to roles as NS and NNS, or even to roles as language teacher and language learner, can be seen in episodes of language instruction found in the data, typically episodes of vocabulary instruction. In this study, after the L2 learner's self-initiation of repair, the interchangers provided the target vocabulary item in the next turn and even confirmed it after the learner's receipt of it. And this also demonstrated their role orientation as a target language expert or language teacher. Of interest is that when the interchangers provided the target word, they oriented to the preceding interactional context, especially to the turn prior to the L2 learner's trouble source turn, except when the L2 learner's candidate solution was produced in the

same turn as the trouble source turn. Also, they confirmed the target word one more time so that the L2 learners could get the input one more time and confirm the word. In one example (excerpt 3), it was demonstrated that another learner, not the repair initiator, could also benefit from the confirmation by the interchanger.

***RQ3 - "Uptake" of the Repair and L2 Vocabulary Development: How an L2 learner orients to learn L2 vocabulary and talk at the same time***

When it comes to this matter, the application of CA methodology can enable the researcher to look at the L2 learner's potential learning behaviors in the interaction. When the L2 learners obtained the target word, they displayed their receipt of new information with (a) a change of state token or (multiple) acknowledgement tokens, (b) repetition of the word, and (c) incorporation, claiming comprehension, recognition, and agreement or orienting to practice the L2 word. Kasper (1997) commented, "In L2 acquisition research, it would indeed be helpful to pay closer attention to the temporal characteristics of speech because they may be one indicator of interlanguage development" (p. 309).

*1. Change of state token:* In response to the L2 vocabulary supply, an elongated "ah" was produced to mark the receipt of new information, sometimes followed by the repetition of the word to claim understanding. According to Heritage (1984), a change-of-state token can indicate that its producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her current state of knowledge, information, orientation, or awareness. However, it should be noted that claiming understanding and demonstrating it are quite different matters (Schegloff, 1982), and the L2 learner's claim of understanding is not direct evidence of *learning*.

*2. Repetition of the word:* The repetition of the target word by the L2 learners indicated their receipt of the word, confirmation, practice, and display of how s/he has heard it. In some cases, the repetition occurred in the full turn solely for practice of the word, which is different from its production for talking, in that it is not sequentially projected. In terms of learning, Ellis (1994) mentioned that even though rote repetition is not the most effective way to learn meaningful material, there may be a role for repetition in learning to produce new foreign language since this is essentially "a motor skill." He also commented that "good language learners know that repetition and practice of new

vocabulary are useful strategies. They do this and in so doing they acquire long-term L2 vocabulary" (p. 249) (slightly modified from the article).

*3. Incorporation:* After the L2 learners obtained the target lexical item, they incorporated the word into their own context so that they could continue the talk and practice it at the same time. To do this, they had to deploy semantic and syntactic resources too. Brouwer (2003), in fact, saw the incorporation of the proffered word into the context as a demonstration of language learning "at least *locally* (i.e. at the particular point of interaction)" (p. 542).

### RQ4 - Ok-son's L2 Vocabulary Development: How we can claim that the learner actually developed vocabulary knowledge through talk-in-interaction and find evidence of learning over time

Ellis (1994) argued that it is more important to investigate how a learner's partial knowledge of words gradually develops than how many words they learn. In this study, there were three examples of vocabulary development: "collect," "suicide," and "younger sister."

In all of these cases, Ok-son had some previous knowledge of the target lexical item in terms of the phonological or semantic features, but she could not retrieve or produce it correctly; she could produce an L1 equivalent word or a similar form of the target word or she could recognize the proffered word by the interchanger. Later, we observed their development through non-mediated use in a more complex context later in the longitudinal data. However, it is true that these can only provide the evidence of developed use of the word and do not indicate the *causal* link between the previous interaction and learning. Kasper (in press) noted, "as far as the causal relationship of interaction and learning goes, CA is not lagging as far behind the well-established approaches to SLA as one might expect."[21]

---

[21] Though, in this study, the learner's verbal report is available and it is quite helpful to understand the process of SLA. Even though in CA researchers frequently do not have any personal contact with the interacting participants, one month after the last data collection, the researcher and the focal participant Ok-son met again, and the issue of learning vocabulary through interchange became the main topic of the talk. Strikingly enough, she talked about the episode of learning the word "suicide." She said,

> I had really wanted to say that word but every time I could not remember the word, so I let it pass. Then, in the interchange conversation, that word became a problem again. At that time, the interchanger was Mayumi and she provided the word. So I learned that word that time.

This study investigated interactions involving L2 learners and L2 development through microanalysis of repair sequences by attempting to pay closer attention to the interactional sequences and overcoming some methodological limitations of the mainstream SLA studies. Even though it resulted in interesting findings that have not been discussed in the literature, such as the demonstration of one learner's L2 vocabulary development over time by tracking the learner's conversation data, there are some limitations, and these should be considered for further study. First, almost all of the examples were from one learner, Ok-son. Therefore, more studies on different L2 learners learning vocabulary through interactions are needed. Second, when analyzing data, audiotape is not enough to examine what is really going on in the interaction. The participant's non-verbal expressions such as eye gaze will be very helpful to understand the learner's conduct.[22] Therefore, video-data will be better for future studies. Lastly, this study demonstrated that the L2 learner's vocabulary was developed and made increasingly more available for effective L2 use. However, it could not demonstrate that the L2 learner's vocabulary knowledge is *first* constituted through interaction and then developed. Therefore, considering all these limitations, more studies in this vein should be pursued for "SLA as a more theoretically and methodologically balanced enterprise that endeavors to attend to, explicate, and explore in more equal measures and, where possible, in integrated ways, both the *social* and *cognitive* dimensions of S/FL *use* and *acquisition*" (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 286).

---

After that, I tried to use that word as much as I can so that I would not forget that again. For example, as a joke, I used to say, 'I wanna kill myself.', but now I say, 'I wanna suicide'.
It seems clear that she remembers when she learned the word quite confidently and was quite surprising and insightful that she could talk about her learning and the situation by herself after a period of time. Even though there is some concern about the recipient design, that is, speakers design their talk in different ways in response to their specific recipients; this verbal report from the learner can provide valuable information about her learning, which could not be found even through fine-grained transcripts.

[22] Some researchers have already shown that those are used in the interaction of word searches and they may work at inviting others to participate in the search (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Hayashi, 2003).

**REFERENCES**

Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal, 87*, 534-45.

Brown, C., Sagers, S. L., & LaPorte, C. (1999). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from oral and written dialogue journals. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*, 259-283.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). *Approaches to communicative competence*. Occasional Papers No. 14. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Dobinson, T. (2001). Do learners learn from classroom interaction and does the teacher have a role to play? *Language Teaching Research, 5*, 189-211.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning, 47*, 173-210.

Ellis, N. (1994). Vocabulary acquisition: The implicit ins and outs of explicit cognitive mediation. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of language* (pp. 211-282). London: Academic Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). Factors in the incidental acquisition of second language vocabulary from oral input: A review essay. *Applied Language Learning, 5*, 1-32.

Ellis, R., Heimbach, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Modified input and the acquisition of word meanings by children and adults. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 63-114). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983a). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Harlow, England: Longman.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983b). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 210-238). Harlow, England: Longman.

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

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62*, 51-75.

Hatch, E. M. (Ed.) (1978). *Second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hauser, E. (2003). Corrective recasts' and other-correction of language form in interaction among native and nonnative speakers of English. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.

Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 36*, 109-141.

He, X., & Ellis, R. (1994). Modified output and the acquisition of word meanings. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 115-132). Amsterdam:  Benjamins.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299-334). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

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

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11*, 39-65.

Huckin, T., & Coady, J. (1999). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: A review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 181-193.

Hwang, J. B. (2002). The effects of negotiated interaction on the L2 vocabulary acquisition: Input or interaction? *Language Research, 38*, 713-728.

Kasper, G. (1997). 'A' stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 307-312.

Kasper, G. (in press). Participant orientations in conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal.*

Kim, Y. H. (2003). The development of discourse markers in Korean as a second language: A conversation analysis study. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Krashen, S. D. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Current issues in bilingual education (pp. 168-180). Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

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

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 303-323.

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

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

Mori, J. (2002). Task-design, plan and development of talk-in- interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 323-347.

Nagata, H., Aline, D., & Ellis, R. (1994). Modified input, language aptitude and the acquisition of word meanings. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 133-150). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Newton, J. (1995) Task-Based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: A case study. *Second Language Research, 11*, 159-177.

Newton, J. (2001). Options for vocabulary learning through communication tasks, *ELT Journal, 55*(1), 30-37.

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51-78). Oxford: Oxford University.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Patibakht, T. (1985). Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency. *Applied linguistics, 6*, 132-146.

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

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington.

Schegloff , E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic.

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, DC: Georgetown University.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shard cognition. In L. R. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Socially shared cognition* (pp. 150-171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

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

Vidal, K. (2003). Academic listening: A source of vocabulary acquisition? *Applied Linguistics, 24*, 56-89.

Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction – A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 215-235.

Wong, J. (2000a). The token "yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*, 39-67.

Wong, J. (2000b). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English Conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 244-67.

# APPENDIX

# TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

| Symbol | Meaning |
|--------|---------|
| . | period, falling, declarative intonation |
| ? | question mark, rising, question intonation |
| , | comma, falling-rising, continuing intonation |
| : | colon, sound elongation, more colons indicate longer elongation |
| - | hyphen, cut-off with glotallization |
| xxx | underlining, greater than normal stress |
| = | equal signs, latched turns with no gap or overlap, or continuation by same speaker from non-adjacent line |
| [ | left bracket, beginning of overlap |
| ] | right bracket, end of overlap (rarely used) |
| (.) | period within parentheses, micropause, hearable pause of less than 0.2 |
| | number within parentheses, pause greater than 0.2 seconds, |
| (1.0) | measured to nearest tenth second laugh token |
| | laugh token |
| ha | audible outbreath, more letters indicate longer outbreath |
| h | audible inbreath, more letters indicate longer inbreath |
| .h | word inside parentheses, best guess at practically incomprehensible |
| (yes) | speech double parentheses, analyst's description of something in the |
| (( )) | transcript, or description of problem with the transcript |
| | words inside degree signs, extra-quiet talk |
| °xxx° | pointed arrows, a marked falling or rising inonational shift. |
| ↓↑ | 'more than and less than' signs, the talk they encompass was produced |
| >< | noticeably quicker than the surrounding talk |