10 Focus on Form in the Wild

Gabriele Kasper and Alfred Rue Burch

Introduction

Learning requires attention to the thing that is being learned. Supported by a large body of research, an influential and longstanding direction in the study of instructed additional language (L2) learning derived from this requirement is an instructional principle called 'Focus on Form' (FonF; Doughty & Williams, 1998). FonF implies that during an ongoing meaning-oriented activity, a student's attention is directed to the form of the utterance (Long & Robinson, 1998), such as a selected word, its pronunciation or morphology, other grammatical features, or indeed sociolinguistic, discourse and pragmatic indicators.

Spurred by the interactionist hypothesis of second-language acquisition (SLA) (Mackey *et al.*, 2012), studies abound on how FonF is implemented through teaching materials and interactional arrangements, and what effect on L2 learning it has. Yet much less research has been devoted to the role of attention to language when L2 speakers learn another language in their lives outside organized instruction (see Barron, 2003; Hassall, 2006 for some exceptions). It is true that from its inception, SLA has been interested in 'spontaneous' language learning and development in immigrants' and sojourners' social environments at work and in their communities, with variable attention to the nexus of social context, language use and learning (Block, 2003; Klein, 1986; Norton, 2000; Perdue, 1993; Schmidt, 1983; Schumann, 1978).

A conversation-analytic (CA) perspective on SLA (CA-SLA) has pulled into view moments where participants turn to learning in the midst of pursuing some other activity in their lifeworld. 'Language learning in the wild' has become a lively research direction within CA-SLA (Brouwer, 2003; Greer, 2013; Ishida, 2009, 2011; Kääntä *et al.*, 2013; Kurhila, 2001, 2006; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b; Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen, 2011; Wagner, 2016). Yet neither the older research strand on spontaneous L2 learning nor the recent studies on L2 learning in the wild have engaged with FonF. There are valid reasons for this. One is, of course, that the older research on spontaneous L2 learning predates

the formulation of the FonF principle. But that does not account for the lack
of uptake of FonF in the literature on spontaneous L2 learning since the 1990s.
Rather, it appears that research on FonF has been confined to classrooms and
the laboratory because these environments allow researchers to systematically
manipulate learners' attention through teaching arrangements and experimen-
tal design. At the same time, directions in non-instructed SLA with an explic-
itly social orientation (e.g. Block, 2007; Norton, 2000) have shown little
engagement with cognitive issues in L2 learning.

In the history of SLA, the dearth of research on FonF in the wild is not
without irony. It was Schmidt and Frota's seminal study (1986) on Schmidt's
learning of Brazilian Portuguese while he was living in that country that
first formulated the need for learners to 'notice the gap' as a necessary condi-
tion for L2 learning. As is well known, this study became the cornerstone of
the noticing hypothesis (Bergsleithner *et al.*, 2013; Schmidt, 2001), the crucial
theoretical foundation of FonF as a principle of language pedagogy. Yet even
the extensive classroom literature has barely begun to explore how attention
to language form is generated, sustained and abandoned in face-to-face inter-
action, and what the consequences of these actions are. Studies under the
interactionist hypothesis have typically focused on predetermined actions
such as (teacher) corrections of student errors (recasts, Lyster & Saito, 2010)
and have not examined how students may direct their attention to language
form through other actions, or how resources other than language afford
FonF. Put differently, interactionist research has sought to answer the classic
question of how teachers' preplanned pedagogical actions affect student
responses and learning outcomes, but the students' agentive participation
and the competencies that make teachers' and students' language-oriented
actions possible in the first place have largely remained under the radar.

For CA research on L2 learning in the wild, a major concern is to examine
the linkage between participants' orientation to language as they strive to
maintain or restore intersubjectivity and shifts from pursuing the activity at
hand to L2 learning. Perhaps researchers investigating L2 learning in the wild
have avoided pointing out the links to FonF in standard SLA in order to clearly
demarcate CA's praxeological stance from the cognitivist conceptualization
of L2 learning that underwrites the notion of FonF. Extending a proposal by
Fasel Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013) to respecify FonF as a principle of
second-language pedagogy, we suggest that gains can be made from respecify-
ing FonF from a praxeological perspective in settings specialized for language
learning as well as in social activities in the wild. This respecification makes
visible two kinds of connections: connections between L2 learning as a social
activity in diverse social settings, and connections between CA-SLA and
other SLA traditions that examine FonF in L2 learning.

Our interest in this chapter is in seeing how FonF comes about in the
course of ordinary social activities that are not arranged for language learn-
ing. The analytical project is to make visible how, and with what

consequences, the participants generate, sustain and abandon attention to language form through their coordinated actions in the ongoing social activity. The connection with the theme of this volume is: what are the competencies that L2 speakers and their interlocutors engage when they turn their attention to language form? In what sense are these competencies 'authentic'? How do they relate to the competencies that people engage to participate in social pursuits other than teaching and learning languages?

To begin, we will consider how CA analysis may afford a lens on the topics of authenticity in the essay by MacDonald *et al.* (2006) that are pertinent to this chapter. After describing how learning is understood in CA, we will unfold the notion of interactional competence as the condition that makes learning in interaction possible. The centerpiece of the chapter is the analysis of an extended segment of mundane conversation in which the participants shift the focus of their talk from an everyday topic to language form in order to address a gap in the L2 speaker's lexicon of Japanese. In the course of plugging the gap collaboratively, the L1 speaker runs into a problem writing the character (*kanji*) of a synonym. After the L2 speaker practices the conjugation of the new word, the L1 speaker returns to her writing difficulty. When the L2 speaker shows that she recognizes the *kanji*, the L1 speaker treats the reversal of epistemic status as incongruent with the normative distribution of category-bound predicates: as a literate L1 speaker of Japanese she is supposed to know *kanji* whereas the L2 speaker is not expected to have that knowledge. From a purely cognitive concern with understanding, knowing and learning a word that comes up in the talk, the interaction thus shifts to knowing *kanji* as an issue of moral rights and obligations. The chapter ends with some thoughts about what can be gained for SLA theory and the practices of language education by respecifying FonF as proposed in the analysis.

Authenticity

Authenticity is not a concept used in CA, but the notion can usefully be inspected from a CA perspective. MacDonald *et al.* (2006) problematize the idea of authenticity as a stable property of (abstract and concrete) objects – *authenticity of correspondence* (*text authenticity, competence authenticity, learner authenticity*) and *authenticity of genesis* (*classroom authenticity*) (the distinction between the two forms of authenticity is attributed to Cooper, 1983). Instead they propose to ask whose text, whose competence and whose meaning defines authenticity in the domain, and what makes classroom texts authentic. In the context of language learning in the wild, *authenticity of genesis*, defined as the *site* of learning, is a moot point since the domain in which learning takes place and the target domain are one and the same, that is, the L2 speaker's lifeworld. In the sense of the *processes* through which learning takes place, *authenticity of genesis* makes relevant a consideration of how

learning is conceptualized and investigated in CA-SLA. The crucial point here is that for CA and cognate traditions there is no learning mechanism separate from or in addition to the sense-making procedures and interactional competencies through which social members, including very young children, manage their participation in social life. Language, culture and interaction are learnable because they are on constant public exhibition in the 'objective production and objective display of commonsense knowledge of everyday activities as observable and reportable phenomena' (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970: 342) and the 'inferential visibility of moral conduct' (Edwards, 1997; Kasper & Wagner, 2014: 194). Consequently, the interactional competencies that enable interaction also enable learning, whether in the wild (Ishida, 2009, 2011; Kääntä *et al.*, 2013; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b; Wagner, 2016) or in classrooms (Lee, 2006; Macbeth, 2000; Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009). For researchers and practitioners who are concerned with learning and development in any arena of social life, it is therefore critical to have an explicit, empirically grounded understanding of how interactional competence can be conceptualized (an ontological question) and how it can be apprehended (an epistemological and methodological question).

Interactional Competence

At the most general and abstract level, interactional competencies are the socially and culturally available practices that people use to manage diverse social undertakings, from everyday activities in the home to frequent and infrequent institutional interactions (classroom lessons or weekly meetings at the workplace versus a citizenship interview, for instance) and arrangements for research such as survey interviews and laboratory experiments. These visibly displayed competencies are authentic, that is, real and consequential for the participants in the ongoing interaction. There is no external warrant of authenticity by teachers, researchers or other parties. What is real and consequential for the participants is not necessarily correct, appropriate or effective for them. With displays of non-understanding, corrections and other forms of repair, participants can treat something that the other party said or did, or that the speaker said or did themselves, as incorrect, inappropriate or ineffective. That does not make that bit of conduct any less authentic than behavior that is tacitly treated as correct, appropriate and effective (tacitly, because normative behavior usually goes unnoticed). Normative and non-normative conduct are produced by the same interactional methods.

Partly under the influence of CA, interactional competence made an early appearance in applied linguistics (Hall, 1993, 1999; He & Young, 1998; Kramsch, 1986; Schmidt, 1983). A sustained effort to specify interactional competence in L2 use, learning and development across a range of social settings has been under way since the mid-2000s and is documented in several

book publications (Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Hall *et al.*, 2011; Hellermann, 2008; Nguyen, 2012; Nguyen & Kasper, 2009; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011). To be interactionally competent in a particular activity – dispensing medicines (Nguyen, 2012), participating in professional meetings (Ford, 2008), teaching English for specific purposes (Okada, 2015) – requires that participants collaboratively organize their undertaking through activity-specific configurations of interactional methods, primarily turn-taking and action sequences, and vocal and non-vocal resources assembled as local, contextually sensitive practices (Young & Miller, 2004). To the extent that interaction is *talk*, language or languages are an important type of resource. Yet when participants cannot draw on a shared linguistic repertoire, or when that repertoire is very limited, they still interact successfully. Preverbal children (e.g. Lerner *et al.*, 2011) are as much competent interactants as are adults with language impairments (Goodwin, 2006). From an evolutionary perspective, Levinson (2006: 42) notes that language is the explicandum, not the explicans: humans did not evolve language, then get involved in a special kind of social life; it was just the reverse. Language must have evolved *for* something for which there was a ready need – that is, for communication in interaction.

The primacy of interaction over language (Levinson, 2006; Schegloff, 2006) has significant implications for understanding language learning and development, and for designing instructional interventions to promote L2 learning. From the empirical literature, Levinson (2006: 45–46) assembled the properties of a universal 'interaction engine' that is foundational to interactional competence. Below we provide our version of Levinson's list. In addition to the generic interactional organizations – turn-taking, sequence organization and repair – features of the machine include the following:

(1) Recipients respond to actions not behaviors. In order to respond to an action, the recipient must interpret the observable behavior at the sequential moment it appears.

(2) Actions are *recipient designed* (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Sacks *et al.*, 1974); that is, they are produced for a specific co-participant. Recipient design takes into account the recipient's knowledge, interests, identities and stances. Therefore a recipient can presume that the action addressed to them is designed to be interpretable specifically for them.

(3) From (1) and (2), it follows that interaction is cooperative in the sense that participants ineluctably listen to, interpret and recipient design actions in turns and sequences. Participants also organize their actions in ways that contribute to the larger undertaking. Cooperation in this sense is a system constraint that operates entirely independently of individual motivation or volition. It does not mean that interaction is harmonious.

(4) Interaction is intensely orderly, but the interaction order is contingent, 'governed not by rule but by expectation' (Levinson, 2006: 45). Interaction cannot be planned out in advance.

(5) Interaction is organized through complementary relational discourse identities (Zimmerman, 1998) such as speaker-listener, teller-recipient, questioner-answerer. The turn-taking mechanism (Sacks *et al.*, 1974) makes alternating discourse identities available. The reciprocity of discourse identities is constrained in formal institutional talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

(6) Interaction self-generates participation structures (Goffman, 1981; Goodwin, 2007) that regulate access and discourse identities, and reflexively transform as the activity progresses.

(7) Interaction is closely timed. Responses are expected to come immediately (although see Mushin & Gardner, 2011, for a cultural adaptation). Delays generate inferences that non-normative circumstances are at play (see Bilmes, 2014, on the difference between silence and delay).

(8) Interaction in face-to-face situations is multimodal. Participants use gesture, facial expression, posture, spatial orientations and materials in the environment to produce actions, identities, stances and social relations (Streeck *et al.*, 2011). Whether or not they include verbal resources, multisemiotic practices are laminated in dense simultaneous and sequential configurations (Goodwin, 2013). These resources and practices exponentially increase the complexity of interaction, but the richness of resources and their contingent assembly on a moment-by-moment basis in no way invalidates Sack's insight that there is 'order at all points' in interaction (Sacks, 1992: 484).

As our analysis will show, the interaction engine propels participants' activity-specific interactional competencies. It is visibly at work not only when the participants get on with the activity at hand, but it also generates shifts to language form and sustains *in situ* language learning when language resources are lacking. Through their unproblematic and problematic understandings, the recipient design of their turns, and their coordinated nonvocal actions, the participants can be seen to mutually 'authenticate' (Bucholtz, 2003) their participation in the activity from moment to moment and the transformations of the participation structure. Based on data from mundane talk involving an L2 speaker of Japanese, we will analyze how the participants engage multisemiotic practices as they achieve, maintain and abandon FonF, and what activities precede and follow the language-focused actions.

Method

Participants and setting

The focal participant in this study is Peony (pseudonym), an L2 speaker of Japanese. Peony had lived and worked in Tokyo for roughly two years

prior to the recording of the data. Having grown up bilingually as a speaker of Taiwanese and Mandarin, she also has a high level of ability in English and is learning Japanese. Based on a corpus of around 14 hours of video-recorded conversations, the larger study investigates how Peony interacts with various co-participants in a range of everyday settings in Japan. In the data for this study, Peony's co-participant is Keiko, an L1 speaker of Japanese who also speaks English as a second language. The two women have known each other for a number of years and get together socially. In the excerpts analyzed below, Peony and Keiko are talking over tea and dessert at a café. In accomplishing this everyday activity, they draw on resources from different semiotic fields (Goodwin, 2013): linguistic and non-linguistic vocalizations; embodiment, including gesture, posture and facial expressions; and technologies such as smart phones, tablets and writing. The semiotic fields that the participants attend to simultaneously and successively are as much afforded by the setting ('brought along') as they produce the setting in the first place ('brought about', Giddens, 1976). Setting can thus be understood as the emerging and constantly evolving 'contextual configurations' (Goodwin, 2013) from which social actions and activities are built.

Data collection and transcription

The interaction was recorded by Peony with a digital voice recorder and a video camera as part of a longitudinal study of her everyday interactions in Japanese, conducted by the second author. The method of entrusting the research participants themselves with the data collection, without the researcher present (Cook, 2008; Ishida, 2009, 2011; Theodórsdóttir, 2011a, 2011b), is common in studies of second-language interaction and learning outside classroom settings ('remote observation method', Iino, 1999; see also Lee & Kinginger, this volume; McGregor, this volume). Peony's conversation with Keiko would have occurred regardless of the data collection or research agenda. The researcher chose neither the setting nor the topics for the conversation, or the focal participant's interlocutors.

As is standard practice in CA, the transcription of the talk adopts the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g. Jefferson, 2004). There is no equivalent standard for transcribing non-vocal aspects such as gesture, gaze and physical actions. The conventions used in this study have been developed by the second author, based on various systems in the literature on CA and multimodal analysis (see Appendix A). Data are analyzed from the complementary perspectives of CA (Sacks, 1992; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013), membership categorization analysis (MCA, Sacks, 1992; Stokoe, 2012), and multimodal analysis (Streeck *et al.*, 2011).

Analysis

Prior to the excerpts analyzed here, Keiko introduced the topic of *shootengai*, translated here as 'shopping arcade', also referred to as 'covered market' in English vernacular. These shopping quarters are common throughout Japanese metropolitan areas. They generally house a variety of small retail stores, including locally owned food, clothing, electronics and stationary shops as well as more specialized vendors. The most notable and defining features of *shootengai* are: (a) they are located on streets (unlike markets and malls); (b) these streets are generally restricted to pedestrian traffic (like pedestrian zones); and (c) they are in large part covered to provide protection from the elements (unlike pedestrian zones). *Shootengai* are part of the cultural geography of urban Japan. As such, any resident of urban areas in Japan is expected to know about them.

FonF: A lexical gap in Peony's knowledge of Japanese

Before the beginning of Excerpt 1, Peony brings up the *shootengai* in Kichijoji, a popular and fashionable neighborhood in West Tokyo outside the urban center (Figure 10.1). In so doing, she displays her knowledge of the cultural geography of the area and shows herself as a culturally competent member. Keiko comments upon how lively and popular (*sakaeteru*) the *shootengai* in Kichijoji is, which is where we pick up the conversation. As we see below, Peony does not know the word *sakaeru*, which leads to an extended language-focused sequence aimed at helping Peony to understand the word and plug her knowledge gap. To this effect, the participants mobilize laminated configurations of semiotic resources to implement such generic actions as repair, word definitions and epistemic status checks. These actions work as methods to accomplish intersubjectivity, language learning and the construction of memberships in social categories.

In Excerpt 10.1, Peony and Keiko successively transition from the conversation about the mutually known *shootengai* to language teaching and learning. In this process, they construct an asymmetrical epistemic relationship in the domain of language knowledge about Japanese.

Excerpt 10.1 [ARB-P20140110 41:28]

```
036    K      ↑kichijooji wa moo, sakaeteru yo ↑ne¿
               PLACE     TOP IP  bustling  IP  IP
               The one in Kichijoji is really bustling, isn't it?

037            (0.3)
```

```
038   P      sakae:¿
              bustl-
              bustl-

      k       +RH down
039   K      +sakaeteru.
               bustling
              Bustling.

040          (0.9)

041   P      akai.=
              red
              Red ((MISREPETITION))

042   K      =sakaeteru tte yuu no wa↓:, (0.4) hanjoo shiteru,
              bustling  QT say NOM TOP           prosperous do

      k        +GZ>slightly left
043          [+aato
               and
              Bustling is…. it's prosperous, and…

      p        +nod
044   P      [+°°↑uh↓°°

045          (1.3)

      k                   +GZ>P
046   K      °>nan no,<° +sakaeteru to shiranai?
               what        bustling QT  know-NEG
              What's that. You don't know bustling?

047          (0.7)

048   P      [°°(    )°°

      k                  +GZ>right
049   K      [sakaeru +tte::
               bustle   QT
              So bustle is…

050          (0.3)

      k       +GZ>table
      k       +RH traces part of 栄
      p                   +GZ>K's tracing-----
051   K      +kanji wa, +(0.4) koo yuu yatsu.
               character TOP    this kind thing
              The kanji is… like this.
```

```
      k       GZ>P, traces the final two strokes slowly
      p       body turns right (to bag), brings up paper
052           (2.2)

      k       +body turns left (to bag)
053   K       +(tatoeba/a pen) (0.6) pen ne?
                for example           pen IP
              (for example / a pen) … a pen?
```


Figure 10.1 Shootengai in Kichijoji (photo courtesy of Jun Kametani)

In line 36, Keiko offers an assessment of the shopping arcade in Kichijoji by describing it as **sakaeteru** ('lively' or 'bustling'). With the interactional particle **yo ne**, Keiko treats the assessed object as equally available to Peony and invites a second assessment (Hayano, 2011). This action reveals two expectations on Keiko's part about Peony's epistemic access: that Peony knows the shopping arcade in Kichijoji, and that she knows the lexical item **sakaeteru**. Peony first responds by 'sounding out' (van Compernolle, 2010) **sakaeteru** with a partial repetition and rising intonation that marks the word as troublesome. After a delay (line 38), Keiko treats the other-initiation of repair as a hearing problem by repeating the word in full with falling intonation (line 39). In so doing, Keiko orients to the preference for trying the easiest solution to an other-initiation of repair first (Svennevig, 2008). Yet the repetition does not result in understanding. After a lengthy pause (line 40), Peony repeats the word as **akai**, which means 'red'. In response, Keiko treats Peony's misrepetition as evidence that Peony does not recognize **sakaeteru**. As a method to resolve the problem, Keiko offers a definition of the lexical meaning of **sakaeteru** (line 42). Specifically, she provides a synonym based upon Chinese morphology (**hanjoo shiteru**), similar to how one might provide a synonym in English by using a word deriving from Greek or Latin. By drawing on Chinese morphology rather than offering a native Japanese-based synonym or using descriptive practices to get the meaning of the problematic word across, Keiko reveals her assumption that Peony, as a competent speaker of Mandarin, will recognize the Chinese-based word as a matter of category-bound knowledge.[1]

Peony's quiet 'uh' in line 44 and the ensuing 1.3 second pause show that Keiko's attributions are not working out. Resorting to another tact, Keiko makes an 'explicit epistemic status check' (Sert, 2013) by asking whether Peony knows the word. Taking the ensuing silence as a disconfirmation, Keiko provides the citation form of the word **sakaeru** (rather than the stative form **sakaeteru** used earlier), followed by the quotative particle **tte**, a turn format (line 49) that projects further talk about the word. While the talk up to this point was directed towards plugging a gap in Peony's lexical knowledge of Japanese in order to solve an understanding problem and resume the topical talk about the Kichijoji shopping arcade, the activity is now completely shifting towards the lexical item as the topic of the talk. In line 51, Keiko turns to a common cultural practice for achieving word recognition among speakers of languages who share a writing system based on Chinese characters, such as Japanese and Mandarin (see Appendix A for a description of *kanji* and Chinese characters). Using her right index finger, she partially traces the *kanji* on the table (line 51, see also Figure 10.2) while Peony maintains her gaze on Keiko's hand. With these coordinated actions, the participants engage in a shared constellation of resources that includes their knowledge of *kanji* as well as the embodied action of tracing the relevant character out.

Figure 10.2 Trace of sakaeru, line 051

As Keiko is tracing the character, she also provides the indexical description **koo yuu yatsu** 'like this', which treats her tracing of the character under Peony's gaze as a sufficient recognitional. However, before Keiko finishes tracing the final two strokes, Peony has turned away to get her notepad from her bag (line 52, see also Figure 10.3). With this action, Peony shows that recognition has not been achieved. Keiko follows suit with a complementary search in her bag while formulating her search target, **pen neʔ** 'a penʔ'. The ordered search actions project another endemic practice, sedimented from prior use between Peony and other interlocutors, namely to write a character on paper in order to accomplish word recognition.

While the excerpt exposes a gap in Peony's lexical knowledge, it illustrates at the same time the interactional competencies that are brought to bear by both Peony and Keiko as they collaboratively navigate an emerging language-related topic as the primary concern of their talk. By first treating a lexical trouble source as a hearing problem, the participants aim for achieving understanding as a condition for advancing the talk about their current topic. When the trouble reveals itself as a lexical gap, they deploy a sequence of sequences (Schegloff, 2007) to level the knowledge asymmetry. These ordered sequences are built upon each other through multiple semiotic resources, beginning with a definition of the item's lexical meaning in

Figure 10.3 Trace of sakaeru, line 052

Japanese through embodied actions such as tracing the *kanji* on the table and accessing the material tools for subsequently writing it. With these mutually recognized and tightly coordinated practices, the participants jointly authenticate FonF as an emergent, discursively achieved activity.

FonF: A successful and a problematic use of *kanji*

Excerpt 10.2 picks up the talk a few lines later as Keiko writes the *kanji* on the paper that Peony has provided. While they are working towards

Excerpt 10.2 [ARB-P20140110 42:12]

```
      p      GZ>paper
      k      writing (栄 sakae)
068          (2.9)

069   K      sa[kaeru.
             bustle
             Bustle.

070   P        [a- aa. (0.2) sagae, hai. (0.2) agae¿
                              *bustle yes        *bustle

      k      +GZ>P
071   K      +sakaeru.
             bustle
             Bustle.

072          (0.3)

      p      +nod
073   P      +uh uh [uh.

      k             +GZ>paper +pen>paper
074   K             [+sakaete, +ato wa >°nan dakke na°<=
                     bustling  and TOP  what COP IP

      k        +GZ>outside
075          =[+muzukashii kanji=wakaranai naa.
               difficult character understand-NEG IP
             It's bustling, and, what was that. I don't know that hard kanji.

      p        +GZ>K>paper
076   P      =[+uh::.
```



```
      k      +GZ>paper
      k      +writing (繁盛 hanjoo?)                          +GZ>P
```

```
077   K      +nanka, konna, koo nan, (0.4) >nanka< koo [nan,+
              something this way this NOM   something this NOM
              Like, this, this way… like this way,


      p                                                      +nod
078   P                                                      [+a- a- (0.2)


      p                                    +GZ>K
079   uh::. (0.2) >wakaru [+wakaru.<
                          understand understand
      uh… I got it, I got it.

      k                                 +BH slightly up
080   K                    [+sono-
                                that
      That-


081        (0.4)


082   P    ippai [(aru) hito¿
           many   *exist person
           There are a lot of people


      k                   +BH wave up toward face
083   K              [minna-+
                       everyone
      Everyone-


084        (0.2)


      k    +nod
      k    +LH down
      k         +RH waving toward self       +RH circle out
085   K    +soo,=+ippai >hito ga kite, ippai< +ka::u?
            yeah  many  person SUB come-CONT, many buy
      Yeah, a lot of people come, and they buy a lot of stuff?

      p    +nod
086   P    +hai.
            yes
      Yes.


      k    RH down
087        (0.3)

      k    +GZ>slightly left
      k              +GZ>P
      k              +RH PRD up, downbeats moving right
088   K    +tokа .hh (.) +>omise ga< ippai narande[te,
            and           shop SUB   many line up-CONT
      And the shops are all lined up


089   P                                             [nn nn [nn

      k                                                    +GZ>RH
      k                                                    +RH shake
090   K                                                    [+>hito ga
                                                             person SUB

      k    +GZ>P   +RH circling                           +RH down
      p                            +nodding
```

```
091          +ippai,=+nigiwat- +(0.3) >kiteru<=[nigiwa-tteru +basho.=
             many      crowded          coming    crowded      place
       There are a lot of people, it's crowde- … they come. It's a crowded place.


       p                                              +nod
092    P                                              [+hnn::::.


093    P    =↑aa:::[:: nigiwatteru¿
                        crowded
       hnnn, aa::: it's crowded?
```

achieving mutual understanding, Keiko shows uncertainty about how the character she is writing to enable Peony to recognize the word is actually written. Peony provides a candidate understanding of the word in her own formulation.

As projected by the participants' getting pen and paper in Excerpt 10.1, Keiko writes the *kanji* for *sakae* (栄) under Peony's watch, followed by saying the citation form **sakaeru**. As Keiko completes the first mora (**sa**) (see Appendix B for a description of mora), Peony overlaps with a claim of recognition (**a- aa.**), suggesting that she has now identified the meaning of the character. Yet she still has not grasped the phonological form of the word, as shown by her non-target-like repetitions (line 70) and Keiko's correction (line 71). Rather than attempting to repeat the word yet another time, Peony claims recognition (**uh uh uh**) (line 73) without demonstrating that she has actually grasped the word (Sacks, 1992). However Keiko treats the recognition claim as a sufficient warrant of understanding to consider the matter resolved.

Keiko now continues the language-focused activity by picking up the Sino-Japanese synonym for *sakaeru* from her turn in line 42, *hanjoo* 'prosperous'. In contrast to her confident writing of the character for *sakae* when it turned out that Peony did not know the word, Keiko prefaces her writing of the character for *hanjoo* by assessing it as difficult (**muzukashii**) and makes a 'claim of insufficient knowledge' (Sert & Walsh, 2013) with the assertion that she does not know how to write it (line 75). Simultaneous with writing the character (supposedly *hanjoo*, although this is hard to tell from the camera angle), Keiko audibly displays her focus on the activity of writing by saying **nanka, konna, koo nan, (0.4) >nanka< koo nan,** 'like, this, this way … like this way'. The verbalizations treat the writing as effortful and solitary and signal to Peony that turn taking is temporarily put on hold.

When Keiko finishes writing and directs her gaze to Peony as a method to re-establish turn taking and solicit a response, Peony again claims recognition with a nod and vocalizations that index a change in epistemic state (**a- a-**), followed by repeated claims to understanding with **wakaru, wakaru** 'I got it, I got it'. She then upgrades her understanding *claim* to a *display* of understanding (Koole, 2010; Sacks, 1992) by providing a candidate definition

with **ippai (aru) hito⸮** 'there are a lot of people' (line 82). Keiko agrees with Peony's definition by nodding and the agreement token **soo** 'yeah'. Next she reformulates and expands upon Peony's formulation while Peony supplies recipient tokens (lines 85–93). In her response **ippai >hito ga kite, ippai< ka::u⸮** 'a lot of people come, and they buy a lot of stuff⸮' (line 85) Keiko treats the structural resources of Peony's preceding turn as a 'public substrate' (Goodwin, 2013: 9) that she selectively reuses and transforms to build a more specific description of the shopping arcade as **sakaeru.** Building upon the prior formulation, Keiko says **>hito ga ippai, =nigiwat- (0.3) >kiteru <=nigiwa-tteru basho.** 'There are a lot of people, it's crowde- … they come. It's a crowded place.' (lines 90–91), and once again recycles a version of these prior turns, this time adding to the description yet another near-synonym for *sakaeru*, **nigiwatteru** 'crowded'. Peony latches on a recognition claim **aa::::** and repeats **nigiwatteru** with slightly rising intonation (line 93), thus offering her understanding up for confirmation.

In this excerpt, the participants again achieve understanding through the practice of writing a problematic lexical item with its *kanji*. Keiko's claim that she does not know how to write the character proves inconsequential since Peony is able to recognize it. Through candidate understandings and reformulations, the participants accomplish a shared understanding of two near-synonyms for **sakaeru** 'bustling', the initial trouble source and knowledge gap in Peony's lexical repertoire of Japanese, **hanjoo suru** 'prosperous' and **nigiwatteru** 'crowded'. They thus generate multiple occasions for focus shifts to the written form and to near-synonyms in the talk. Following Peony's show of understanding after the *hanjoo* sequence, it is noticeable that Keiko's descriptions specifically characterize the *shootengai* in Kichijoji rather than offering abstract definitions of **sakaeru**. With the shared semiotic repertoire in place, the participants show themselves ready to shift their talk entirely back to its previous topical focus.

FonF: Doing conjugation

However, in Excerpt 10.3, Peony returns to a focus on the initial trouble source, the lexical item *sakaeru*. In particular, she is seeking to confirm the difference between the citation form and the stative form of the verb.

Excerpt 10.3 [ARB-P20140110 42:33]

```
        k                       +click pen, pen PNT>forward
        k                                +RHIF PNT>forward
094    K            [soo soo.=+shichijooji +tte:,
                     yeah yeah PLACE        QT


        k       +RHIF PNT>P    +RH down
```

```
095              [+>soo yuu toko<+ [deshoo?
                    that kind place COP
                 Yeah yeah.  Shichijoji is that kind of place, right?

096    P         [uhn.                  [sakaeru:?
                  yeah                   bustle
                 Yeah…  bustle?

       k         +nod
097    K         +°n[n.°
                 Yeah.

       p              +RHIF forward down
098    P           [+saeteru?
                       *bustling
                 Bustling ((MISREPETITION))

099    K         [sakaeteru.
                  bustling
                 Bustling

       p          +nod
       p          +RH>cheek
100    P         [+hai hai.
                  yes yes
                 Yes, yes.

101              (0.3)

       p         +GZ>paper
       p         +LH>paper             +LH retract
       k               +GZ>paper
102    P         +saka:e+teru. [uh: +sakaeteru.
                  bustling           bustling
                 Bustling. Uhh, bustling.

       k                           +clicking pen
103    K                   [soo. +sakaeteru.
                             yeah bustling
                 Yeah. Bustling.

       k         writing (さかえる sakaeru?)
104              (0.3)

       p         +nod
105    P         +↑uhn.

       k         writing
106              (3.4)

107    P         nn::.
```

```
       k      writing, hands paper to P
  108         (4.1)

       p                       +RH>paper, puts paper in front of her
       p                       +nod
  109  P      ↑nn::, sakaeru. [+nn nn nn.
                         bustle
              Yeah, bustle. Yeah yeah yeah.


  110  K                        [nn::.


  111         sakaeru.
              bustle
              Yeah. Bustle.


       p               +GZ>K+      +GZ>paper
       p               +RH taps paper
  112  P      hhyeah, +kichijooji +(0.3) [sakaeru.
                        PLACE                bustle
              Hhyeah, Kichijoji… bustle.


  113  K                                    [sakaeru…
                                             bustle
              Bustle.
```

After affirming Peony's understanding of **nigiwatteru**, Keiko brings the talk back to the topic of Kichijoji (pronouncing the place name with a non-standard initial voiceless alveolo-palatal sibilant) by describing the location with the anaphoric reference **soo yuu toko** 'that kind of place' (line 95) and soliciting agreement from a position of epistemic primacy with the stance marker **deshoo** (Cook, 2012). Peony agrees with the assessment shortly after Keiko produces the place name, showing her (correct) expectation of where the turn is heading. Yet overlapping with the turn-final **deshoo**, Peony says **sakaeru:ʔ**. Although the word meaning could be heard as a second assessment, the citation form and rising intonation treat the item as a learning object. The talk reverts again to its previous language focus as Peony solicits confirmation of the word form. Following Keiko's confirmation, Peony manipulates the word form by saying **saeteruʔ**, ostensibly an unsuccessful attempt at producing the stative form *sakaeteru* (see Appendix B for the difference between citation and stative forms of verbs in Japanese). Keiko aligns with Peony's treatment of the current activity as *doing conjugation* (see Brouwer, 2004, on *doing pronunciation* in L2 talk) by correcting the mispronunciation to **sa<u>ka</u>eteru**. (line 99). After the correction, Peony practices the form by repeating it twice (line 102), the second time in overlap with Keiko's affirmation of the form practice. At this point, the correction sequence is complete and the talk could return to the topic of Kichijoji. Yet Keiko treats Peony's knowledge of the trouble source item as still at risk. Launching a post-completion sequence (Schegloff, 2007), she writes what appears to be the citation form *sakaeru* in hiragana. When

Keiko hands Peony the paper, Peony emphatically affirms her recognition of the word with a high-pitched turn-initial affirmation token and repetition of the citation form. In overlap with a series of turn-final affirmation tokens (line 109), Keiko re-affirms Peony's recognition display by repeating Peony's preceding turn. Now that the parties have mutually reaffirmed that they have reached a shared understanding of *sakaeru*, Peony signals with a turn-initial code-switched **hhyeah** that she is ready to leave the vocabulary activity behind after applying the citation form *sakaeru* to describe the place referent Kichijoji (line 112), in overlap with Keiko's collaborative completion of the turn.

Excerpt 10.3 is framed by both participants' attempts to return the topic from a language-focused activity to the talk about a mutually known locality. After Peony insists on practicing the morphology of *sakaeru* and so resumes the FonF, Keiko engages yet another writing practice to secure Peony's knowledge of the target item by writing it in hiragana. Following a strong recognition display, Peony's application of the target item to characterize the shopping arcade shows her readiness to end the vocabulary learning activity and resume the disrupted everyday talk. Yet this time around, it is Keiko who launches a language-focused topic.

FonF: Keiko's uncertain knowledge of a *kanji*

Up to now, the participants have treated Peony's preoccupation with learning a new word as par for the course. Her lexical gap generated an epistemic asymmetry between Keiko as expert and occasioned teacher of Japanese and Peony as a novice and student. In common sense understanding, these complementary knowledge statuses are normatively associated with the categories of L1 speaker and L2 speaker, respectively. For the participants as well, the association of category membership and knowledge is self-evident. But we also observed that on one occasion, Keiko showed having trouble writing a character. As the talk returns to the writing of that 'difficult' character in Excerpt 10.4, the knowledge asymmetry between Peony and Keiko reverses.

Excerpt 10.4 [ARB-P20140110 42:46]

```
113   K                                  [sakaeru.=>demo ko-< tabun=
                                          bustle   but this-  maybe

      p      +GZ>K
      k      +GZ>paper
      k      +LH across table>paper
      k                      +body left (to bag)
114          =+>kono< kanji +$machigaeteru$. [>tabun.<
                this character mistaken        maybe
             Bustle. But this- maybe this character is wrong. Maybe.
```

```
         p                                          +GZ>paper
         p                                          +mouth agape
   115   P                                          [+khh


         k    +GZ>P               +body left, pulls out tablet
   116   K    +shoobai hanjoo no +(hoo chotto imi shirabete).
              commerce prosperity GEN one little meaning look-up-CONT

   117        .hh de, muzukashii hoo yatta ↓no.=
                  and difficult one do-PST NOM
              I looked up the prosperity related to commerce and, and chose the difficult one.


         p                        +RH>pen                +writing
   118   P    =muzukashi-. (.) +a- wakaru okuru. (0.3) +tabun chi-
              difficult.          understand send      maybe *

   119        kore
              this
              Difficult. a- I got it (*I got it) (0.3) maybe th- this.


         k    GZ at tablet
   120        (0.7)


         k    GZ at tablet
   121   K    hon↑too?
              really
              Really?


         p    GZ>K
   122        (0.6)


         k    +leans in, GZ>paper
         p    +hands paper across table
   123   P    +tabun kore?
              maybe this
              Maybe this?


   124        (0.6)


         k        +GZ>P                      +lean in (tablet>chest)
         p        +pulls paper back +GZ>paper
   125   K    SOO. +$NANDE SHITTERU  +NO, A [+YABAI.$
              yeah why know          NOM   ah  terrible
              Yeah!  How do you know that!?!  Oh my god.


         p                                          +pen>paper
   126   P                                          [+üü:::


         p    writing
   127   P    [nn:::


         p    writing
         k     +GZ>paper
   128   K    [+.hhh $chotto matte, doo yatte kaiku n¿$
                     little wait   how do    *write
              Hold on, how do you write that?
```

```
         p      writing
129             (0.4)

         p      writing
130  P          kore no::¿
                this GEN
                This one?

131             (0.4)

         p      writing
         p      GZ>paper
132  K          soo:: soo soo sonna $kanji, sonna [yatsu:$
                yeah  yeah yeah that-kind character that-kind one
                Yeah yeah yeah. That kind of character, that one.

         p                                     +GZ>K
         p                                     +RH tap on paper
133  P                                         [+sakaeru?
                                                bustle
                Bustle?

         k            +nod
134  K          .hhh +soo.=
                      yeah
                Yeah.

         p      +GZ>paper
         p            +pen>paper
135  P          =+soo.+kono kanji?=
                  yeah this character
                Yeah. This character?

136  K          =eru [eru.
                 eru  eru
                Eru, eru ((final two hiragana of sakaeru, repeated))

         p            writing
137  P          [aa/::\:: hai. °(yeah, sa[kaeru)°
                          yes           bustle
                aa::::: yes. Yeah, bustle.
```

Gazing at the paper in front of her, Keiko admits that one of the characters she wrote might be wrong. With this admission she invokes her earlier assessment of the character for *hanjoo* 'prosperity' as difficult and the claim that she does not know it (lines 74–75). She then accounts for the possible mistake by describing how she came to write that particular character. With the account – to gloss, she looked up the characters for *hanjoo* and chose the one most related to commerce, which also happened to be the most difficult character to write (lines 116–117) – Keiko orients in various ways to her epistemic status and to shared knowledge of *kanji*. First, by returning the talk to the writing of the character and accounting

for its possible incorrectness, Keiko shows her understanding that it is her epistemic obligation (Stivers *et al.*, 2011) to provide Peony with correct information about Japanese and her category-bound obligation as an educated L1 speaker of Japanese to have the required literacy skills to do so. Secondly, by describing how she selected the *kanji* from the online dictionary, she implies that she was not able to retrieve the character from her own knowledge but had to rely on the online dictionary as distributed memory (Hutchins, 1995, 2006). This method to access the character is treated as a taken-for-granted cultural practice[2] by both Keiko and Peony. Thirdly, by describing how she selected the character, Keiko presumes that Peony knows that there are multiple homonyms pronounced as *hanjoo*. This presumption trades on knowledge about the structure of *kanji* that is shared by literate users of Japanese and Chinese, namely that homophony is prevalent in Chinese.

At first Peony affiliates with Keiko's stance by repeating **muzukashii** 'difficult' (line 118). Yet as her next action, she produces a clipped change of state token (**a-**) and claims to know which character is the correct one. As she begins to write the character, she announces a proposal by saying 'maybe this'. While Peony is writing, Keiko maintains her gaze on her tablet even when she responds to Peony's announcement with a display of skepticism (**hon ↑ too↗** 'really'↗, line 121). Having finished writing, Peony hands the paper to Keiko while repeating 'maybe this↗' to solicit Keiko's response to her proposal (line 123).

After a short pause as she reads what Peony has written, Keiko produces a response turn in a markedly louder voice. As projected by Peony's solicit, she first affirms that Peony has written the character correctly. Her next actions display surprise at Peony's knowledge of the character. With **NANDE SHITTERU NO** ('How do you know that') Keiko uses a reverse polarity question (Koshik, 2005) that treats Peony's knowledge of a character that Keiko does not know as contravening the normative distribution of category-bound knowledge. Without formulating the category, Keiko implicitly categorizes Peony as *hen na gaijin*, a 'strange foreigner' (Nishizaka, 1999), who shows category-incongruent and therefore illegitimate access to a knowledge domain that should be under Keiko's control instead (cf. Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, for the notion of 'illegitimizing' identities). The following assessment **A YABAI** ('Oh my God', lit. 'terrible') upgrades Keiko's stance on the reversal of epistemic status relations. After a further, weaker surprise display (**chotto matte,** 'wait') Keiko requests that Peony show her how to write the character (line 128). The demonstration (lines 129–132) ends with Keiko's emphatic recognition of the character. In the next sequence, the participants revert to their normative epistemic relationship. Peony once again solicits affirmation of the character for *sakaeru* ('bustle'), and Keiko reminds Peony to add the hiragana える (eru) to the character, which Peony registers as something she did not consider.

Post-FonF: The morality of knowing *kanji*

In the last portion of the excerpt, Keiko returns to expressing surprise about what she treats as non-normative distribution of knowledge between her and Peony. The association of epistemic rights and obligations with membership in cultural communities occupies most of the ensuing talk.

Excerpt 10.5 [ARB-P20140110 42:46]

```
        k                                              +GZ>P
138   K                              [yaba:i, [chotto +matte=
                                      terrible little wait
        Oh my god.  Hold on!


139   P                                      [aa:::

140   K      =nande pioni $kakete watashi wa kake[↑nai$ .hhh
              why   NAME write-can I      TOP write-can-NEG
        Why can you write it and I can't?

        p                                      +GZ>K
        p                                      +smiles
141   P                                      [+yay:::::.

142   K      YA[BAI.
              terrible
        My god!

        p          +RH out toward K, retract
        p               +GZ>down
        p               +folding paper
143   P      [+gamba[+tte::::::.
               work hard
        Work hard!

        k                   +head rest on RH
        k                   +GZ>outside
144   K      [>are, +atashi< nihonjin dakke [naa.
                IP    I         Japanese person IP IP
        Huh? But I'm Japanese.

        p                                      +GZ>K
145   P                                      [+$motto
                                               more

        k      +GZ>P
146        +gambaru.$ hh
            work hard
        Work harder!

        k                   +head tilt right
        k                   +GZ>tablet
147   K      [$iya are, +okashii na. .hh
               bad that, strange IP
        That's bad.  Strange.

        p      folding paper
        p       +GZ>paper
148   P      [+((laugh))
```

```
      k      GZ at tablet
      p                         +puts pen down on K's side of table
149   K      dokka icchatta. +(1.4) kakeru.=↑pin sugoi ne,=
             where go-PST-totally IP  write-can NAME amazing IP

150          yoku kanji ka[keru ne.
             well characters write-CAN IP
             Where on earth did it go.  (1.4).  You can write, you're amazing.  You can
             write the characters well, huh?

      p                         +GZ>K
151   P                         [+a kanji a- (0.2) kanji ga a- a- um (0.3)
                                 character        character SUB

      k      +GZ>P
152          +kantan.
             easy
             The characters are (0.2) the characters are a- a- um (0.3) easy.

      k      GZ>tablet
153          (0.5)

154   K      °nn:[:.°

      p           +RHIF PNT>throat
      p                  +GZ>down
      p                  +RH>down
      k                  +GZ>P      +GZ>tablet
155   P      [+watashi +(iru) ni +(0.6) watashi ni:
              I         *    for          I          for
             For me. (0.6) For me.

156          (0.5)

      k      +slight nod
157   K      +nn::.

      p                            +GZ slowly>K
      k                             +GZ>P
158   P      sonna- (0.4) ni: uh +muzuku+shik- (0.6)
             that much            difficult-*NEG

159          muka [a-
             *
             They really aren- that hard (0.6) har-

      k                                 +GZ>tablet
160   K      [>muzukashiku<nai? [pin+chan ni totte,=
              difficult-NEG       NAME       for
             They're not hard? For you,

      p                                  +shakes head
161   P                         [+°muzukashikunai°
                                  difficult-NEG
             Not hard.
```

```
162   K        =muzukashi[kunai?=
               difficult-NEG
               Not hard?


      p                      +nod
163   P                      [+uhn. =nn.
```

In the beginning of the excerpt, Keiko upgrades her earlier surprise response (line 125). Repeating the negative assessment **ya<u>ba:</u>i** 'terrible' and using a reverse polarity question (line 140; Koshik, 2005), she implicitly categorizes Peony and herself as members of different cultural communities who normatively have access to exclusive knowledge territories. Specifically, she treats Peony's demonstrated ability to write in Japanese, and her own lack of that ability on this particular occasion, as category incongruent, as epistemic trespassing on Peony's part and failure on her part to live up to her epistemic obligations to Peony. Peony responds with humor, first with a celebratory **yay::::** and, after Keiko again expresses surprise, by teasing her with **gambatte:::::** 'work hard'. The appeal to 'work hard' (often translated as 'good luck') is common in Japanese, especially in educational settings or other situations that require effort, used to encourage the recipient to persist and do their best in the face of a difficult task. It is not a routine response to a self-deprecation. An expected second pair part would have been a disagreement with, or minimization of, Keiko's negative self-assessment (Pomerantz, 1984). Instead the encouragement to 'work hard' agrees with Keiko's assessment and thus aligns with Keiko's censuring herself for being a 'bad Japanese'. Such an action could be disaffiliative, but as Peony's turn is produced in a light tone and with a smile, it comes off as a friendly tease. Prefaced with a response that shows mild surprise (**are,** 'huh◌?'), Keiko further steps up her account of why the knowledge asymmetry between her and Peony diverges from the normal. She now goes on record with her appeal to contrasting cultural membership by explicitly categorizing herself as Japanese (>**atashi**< **nihonjin dakke naa.**, line 144). With the self-categorization, Keiko invokes Peony's identity as non-Japanese and the contrasting epistemic responsibilities associated with their cultural identities. In this way Keiko further takes herself to task for not knowing the character. Her self-blame gets another, upgraded tease in which Peony urges Keiko to **motto gambaru** ('work harder') while maintaining her smile. Keiko affiliates with the tease by assessing her knowledge gap as **iya** 'bad' and **okashii** 'strange' while smiling together with Peony. With the joint smiling and Peony's laughter during Keiko's self-deprecation, the participants accomplish a good natured and lighthearted 'matching stance' (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012). In an effort to restore her tainted expertise as a writer of Japanese, Keiko downgrades the problem by claiming that the characters 'went somewhere' (line 149), implying that she knew them at some point.

In the remainder of the excerpt, the topical focus shifts from Keiko's difficulty writing in the character to Peony's ability to do so. Keiko initiates the topic shift by complimenting Peony on her ability to write the characters (lines 149–150). Peony rejects the compliment by assessing the characters as easy (**kantan**) and, when Keiko acknowledges the rejection without conveying understanding (line 154), provides an account for her assessment. Claiming that the characters are easy *for her* (line 155), Peony invokes her identity as an L1 speaker of Mandarin for whom writing Chinese characters is a taken-for-granted ability, an account that Keiko accepts after some reluctance, as her repeated other-initiations of repair (lines 160, 162) indicate. As they are reaching agreement on Peony's account, both participants reuse the lexical item *muzukashii* 'difficult' from Keiko's earlier assessment of the character (line 117). In this way they overtly set themselves into opposing relations towards the assessment object: the character for hanjoo is *muzukashii* 'difficult' for Keiko but *muzukashikunai* 'not difficult' for Peony. At the end of the talk initiated by Keiko's description of the shopping arcade in Kichijoji, the participants have reversed their relative epistemic statuses entirely. From an L2 speaker turned language learner at the moment she shows her non-understanding of a word in Japanese that she did not know, Peony assumes the status of expert in *kanji* when Keiko takes up the complementary status of a less knowledgeable writer of Japanese.

Despite occasional moves by both participants to return the talk to the shopping arcade, for the better part of their conversation their focus remains on the word meaning, the phonological, morphological and written forms of the original trouble source item in two writing systems, and the difficulty writing the *kanji* for the related Sino-Japanese word. The sustained and repeatedly reentered FonF on form is accomplished through the dense coordination of multisemiotic practices such as showing attentiveness and inattentiveness through gaze, affiliation through smiling, body movements for searching, tracing a character on the table, writing *kanji* on paper, selecting *kanji* from an online dictionary, and using Japanese as a resource to jointly accomplish actions and as an object for learning.

Discussion and Conclusions

We observed how in ordinary conversation, a lexical understanding problem prompts participants to shift from achieving intersubjectivity in talking about a mundane topic in their shared lifeworld to the spoken and written forms of the lexical item and its synonyms. In the course of a sustained interactional focus on the learning object that involves word definitions and form practice, a problem with writing the character of a synonym generates a concern with category-bound distributions of epistemic rights and obligations, which are taken as an occasion for doing friendship with good natured

teasing. The participants accomplish these contingently emerging activities with laminations of resources from a range of semantic fields. The dense configurations of resources in particular sequential environments become interpretable as actions that are visibly designed for the co-participant. Earlier action configurations, most notably the turns including a form of the lexical item *sakaeru* and Keiko's assessment of the *kanji* for *hanjoo* as *muzukashii* 'difficult', are treated as public substrates that are transformed to fit the interactional project at hand. Through the same interactional competencies, driven by the relentless workings of the interaction engine, the participants achieve intersubjectivity, establish and maintain a joint focus on language form through learning and teaching, invoke memberships in social categories, and construct social relations. The participants visibly engage in these undertaking not only *with* but *for* each other and in so doing mutually authenticate their contributions every step of the way.

The FonF in the wild activity we observed in this conversation was sustained over multiple turns and re-entered several times after the participants had resumed their talk about the shopping arcade. Peony's and Keiko's extended engagement with a learning object contrasts with a case reported by Theodórsdóttir (2011b), in which the participants maintain FonF for no more than a two-turn insert sequence in order to establish the meaning of a critical lexical item that the L2 speaker is uncertain about. In Theodórsdóttir's study, the participants are buying and selling bread in a bakery in Iceland. It could therefore be argued that with the quick return to the main activity, the L2 Icelandic-speaking customer and L1 Icelandic-speaking salesperson show their orientation to getting on with the commercial transaction (other customers waiting in line, etc.), whereas our participants are having a leisurely talk in a coffee shop and are therefore afforded the latitude to linger on matters of language form and their wider repercussions. While this is entirely plausible, it is not the case that social setting determines the length and quality of FonF on form in the wild. In an episode recorded in a supermarket in Denmark, Wagner (2016) shows that an L1 Danish-speaking customer and an L2 Danish-speaking clerk engage in extended side sequences between the customer's initial request for a sales item and the successful completion of the transaction. Here the shift to FonF is first prompted by the customer, who treats the clerk's initial problem with hearing the reference to the product as indicating a lexical gap, while the clerk orients to remembering where the product is located. Similarly to Peony's and Keiko's conversation, the participants make relevant normative associations between social category membership and epistemic status, but in the supermarket episode it is the L2 speaker who treats that association as problematic.

For participants in social activities in the wild, then, it is possible to shift their joint attentional focus to language form as an opportunity for language learning and teaching, augmenting the L2 speaker's knowledge of

grammar, lexis and pronunciation, confirming or correcting uncertain knowledge and even engaging in formal practice. For SLA, the purchase of studying the social organization of FonF in the wild is, minimally, to get detailed insight into how FonF emerges while participants are pursuing activities in their lifeworld, how FonF is afforded through actions and multisemiotic practices, and how the participants treat the form-focused project as completed and shift their interactional concerns back to their main pursuit.

But there is more to gain. A praxeological perspective on cognition and on knowing, using and learning languages shows that these matters are interrelated with memberships in social categories and category-bound epistemic rights and obligations. As such they have an ineluctable moral dimension. In this study (but not in Wagner, 2016), the moral dimension of language-focused interaction is backgrounded as long as social category incumbencies and knowledge distribution are tied together as normatively expected: Keiko shows herself as an expert and occasioned teacher of her first language, and Peony shows herself as relative L2 novice and eager student. When language status and knowledge become dissociated at the moment that Keiko admits to a gap in her knowledge of a *kanji* that Peony recognizes unproblematically, the morality of knowing and not-knowing the character becomes a strongly foregrounded issue for the participants, made relevant and consequential through Keiko's self-reprimand and formulation of contrasting memberships in cultural categories, and Peony's teasing. For SLA and language education, these connections are worth giving serious consideration to because they shed important light on the conditions and practices of language learning as a social undertaking.

Appendix A: Transcription Conventions

For the transcription of talk

TOP	topic marker
GEN	generative marker
COP	copula
FIL	non-lexical filler
POL	politeness marker
FP	final particle
1P	first person pronoun
,	continuing intonation
.	final intonation
¿	rising intonation
꜀	slightly rising intonation
↓word	abruptly falling intonation

wo:rd	lengthening of the previous sound
=	latching (no space between sound before and after)
[	overlap
(0.7)	pause timed in tenths of seconds
(.)	micropause, shorter than 0.2 seconds
°word°	speech which is quieter than the surrounding talk
WORD	speech which is louder than the surrounding talk
bold	talk
talk	translation
*	unglossed particle

For the transcription of embodied action

H	hand(s)	*F*	finger
R	right	*IF*	index finger
L	left	*2Fs*	index & middle fingers
B	both	*3Fs*	index, middle & ring fingers
GZ	gaze		
+	place where action begins, description of action		
+	place where action begins in relation to talk		
/	stroke or beat of gesture		
—-	holding gesture or gaze in place		

Palm positions

PRD	prone down	(palm facing ground)
SPU	supine up	(palm facing up)
SPV	supine vertical	(palm facing in)

Appendix B: Japanese Language

I. Writing

Japanese utilizes a number of different writing systems, including *kanji*, *hiragana*, *katakana* and *roomaji*. As only *kanji* and *hiragana* are at issue in the current data, we will provide only a brief explanation of the relevant concerns.

Kanji (literally 'Chinese characters'), and ideographic and logographic characters which have primarily been borrowed from Chinese. Japanese and the various Chinese languages (including Mandarin and Cantonese among others) use these characters, which provides for a shared resource between speakers of the languages. However, there are some constraints that arise from the cross-linguistic use of *kanji* that are relevant to the data in this chapter.

(1) While the characters tend to have only one reading in Chinese, they can have multiple readings in Japanese. Some, the *onyomi*, are derived from Chinese, but have been adapted to the phonotactic constraints of Japanese. *Kunyomi*, on the other hand, are native Japanese readings that are not related to Chinese.

(a) In relation to the characters discussed in the data, the Japanese word *sakaeru* is *kunyomi* (native reading). The *onyomi* of the character is *ei*, while the Mandarin pronunciation is *róng*. Notice that while the *onyomi* is derived from Chinese, the derivation may not be obvious to the average speaker – beyond the sound changes to fit Japanese phonotactics, both languages have undergone diachronic changes since the time that the *kanji* were borrowed.

(2) Even though a word is written with *kanji*, some Japanese words do not exist in Chinese and vice-versa. For example, the word *hanjoo* ('to be prosperous') is written in Japanese with the characters 繁盛 or 繁昌. However, these compounds are not used in Mandarin.

(3) *Kanji* have undergone various degrees of simplification in Japanese and Chinese. In Taiwan, traditional unsimplified characters are used, while in Japan, somewhat simplified forms are used. Mainland China uses a much more simplified system. This is illustrated by the character for *sakaeru* here:

Taiwan	Japan	Mainland China
榮	栄	荣

Hiragana are representations of *mora* (Vance, 1987), which are combinations of vowels, consonants plus vowels, or in the case of double consonants or final nasals, a single consonant. In the case of *sakaeru*, the word would be written in *hiragana* as さかえる. In general, *hiragana* are used to represent grammatical elements that would otherwise not be written in *kanji*; thus *sakaeru* is usually written as 栄える, where the *kanji* is used for the verb root, and the *hiragana* are used for elements that would be subject to sound change in conjugation. *Hiragana* are also used when the a person does not know or forgets the *kanji*, or uses them for the sake of brevity, as when writing memos.

II. Grammar

Both of the words at issue in the data, *sakaeru* and *hanjoo suru*, are stative verbs; that is, while they are grammatically verbs, they describe a state. When written in dictionaries or otherwise referenced in citation forms, they appear as written here. However, in mundane discourse, both generally appear in their stative/progressive forms, *sakaeteiru* and *hanjoo shiteiru*, both of which are contracted by omitting the *i* that appears before the verb ending -*ru*.

Acknowledgments

Notes

(1) In Mandarin, the word *hanjoo* (繁盛) is not used, but the characters would be read as *fánshèng*. The word that is used in Mandarin (繁栄) is pronounced as *fánróng* in Mandarin and as *hanei* in Japanese – not necessarily recognizable across the languages.
(2) By this we mean that for the participants, electronic resources such a smartphones and tablets are readily available tools that they use as unremarkable resources to pursue their project of the moment. Reflexively, with their self-evident use of digital media to solve a local language problem, Keiko and Peony show themselves as members of a shared contemporary culture.

References

Barron, A. (2003) *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bergsleithner, J.M., Frota, S.N. and Yoshioka, J.K. (eds) (2013) *Noticing and Second Language Acquisition: Studies in Honor of Richard Schmidt*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Bilmes, J. (2014) Preference and the conversation analytic endeavor. *Journal of Pragmatics* 64, 52–71.

Block, D. (2003) *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Block, D. (2007) *Second Language Identities*. London: Continuum.

Brouwer, C.E. (2003) Word searches in NNS–NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal* 87, 534–546.

Brouwer, C.E. (2004) Doing pronunciation: A sequence of novice–expert interaction. In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds) *Second Language Conversations* (pp. 93–113). London: Continuum.

Bucholtz, M. (2003) Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7, 398–416.

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005) Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7, 585–614.

Cook, H.M. (2008) Language socialization in Japanese. In P. Duff and N. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization* (2nd edn) (pp. 313–326). New York: Springer.

Cook, H.M. (2012) Language socialization and stance-taking practices. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (eds) *The Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 296–321). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cooper, D.E. (1983) *Authenticity and Learning: Nietzsche's Educational Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2012) Exploring affiliation in the reception of conversational complaint stories. In A. Peräkylä and M.-L. Sorjonen (eds) *Emotion in Interaction* (pp. 113–146). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doughty, C.J. and Williams, J. (1998) Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C.J. Doughty and J. Williams (eds) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 197–262). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, D. (1997) *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.

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

Ford, C.E. (2008) *Women Speaking Up: Getting and Using Turns in Workplace Meetings*. New York: Palgrave.

Gardner, R. and Wagner, J. (eds) (2004) *Second Language Conversations*. London: Continuum.

Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. (1970) On formal structures of practical action. In J.C. McKinney and E.A. Tiryakian (eds) *Theoretical Sociology* (pp. 338–366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Giddens, A. (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method*. London: Hutchinson.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (2006) Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment: Multimodal utterances and pointing in aphasia. In N.J. Enfield and S.C. Levinson (eds) *Roots of Human Sociality* (pp. 97–125). Oxford: Berg.

Goodwin, C. (2007) Interactive footing. In E. Holt and R. Clift (eds) *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction* (pp. 16–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Greer, T. (2013) Establishing a pattern of dual-receptive language alternation. *Australian Journal of Communication* 40, 47–62.

Hall, J.K. (1993) The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics* 14, 145–167.

Hall, J.K. (1999) A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 137–151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J.K., Hellermann, J. and Pekarek-Doehler, S. (eds) (2011) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hassall, T. (2006) Learning to take leave in social conversations: A diary study. In M.A. DuFon and E. Churchill (eds) *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts* (pp. 31–58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hayano, K. (2011) Claiming epistemic primacy: *yo*-marked assessments in Japanese. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds) *The Morality of Knowledge* (pp. 58–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, A.W. and Young, R. (1998) Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. Young and A.W. He (eds) *Talking and Testing: Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hellermann, J. (2008) *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. and Clayman, S. (2010) *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hutchins, E. (1995) *Cognition in the Wild.* Boston, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Hutchins, E. (2006) The distributed cognition perspective on human interaction. In N.J. Enfield and S.C. Levinson (eds) *Roots of Human Sociality* (pp. 375–398). Oxford: Berg.

Iino, M. (1999) Language use and identity in contact situations. In L.F. Bouton (ed.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (Vol. 9; pp. 129–162). Urbana, IL: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Ishida, M. (2009) Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H.t. Nguyen and G. Kasper (eds)

Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual Perspectives (pp. 351–387). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Centre.

Ishida, M. (2011) Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti and J. Wagner (eds) *L2 Learning as a Social Practice: Conversation Analytic Perspectives* (pp. 45–56). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Jefferson, G. (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G.H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 131–167). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kääntä, L., Jauni, H., Leppänen, S., Peuronen, S. and Paakkinen, T. (2013) Learning English through social interaction: The case of Big Brother 2006, Finland. *Modern Language Journal* 97, 340–359.

Kasper, G. and Wagner, J. (2014) Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 34, 171–212.

Klein, W. (1986) *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koole, T. (2010) Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43, 183–209.

Koshik, I. (2005) *Beyond Rhetorical Questions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

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

Kurhila, S. (2006) *Second Language Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lee, Y.-A. (2006) Towards respecification of communicative competence: Condition of L2 instruction or its objective? *Applied Linguistics* 27, 349–376.

Lerner, G.H., Zimmerman, D.H. and Kidwell, M. (2011) Formal structures of practical tasks: A resource for action in the social life of very young children. In C. Goodwin, C. LeBaron and J. Streeck (eds) *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World* (pp. 44–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S.C. (2006) On the human 'interaction engine'. In N.J. Enfield and S.C. Levinson (eds) *Roots of Human Sociality* (pp. 39–69). Oxford: Berg.

Long, M.H. and Robinson, P. (1998) Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C.J. Doughty and J. Williams (eds) *Focus on Form in Classroom SLA* (pp. 15–41). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. and Saito, K. (2010) Effects of oral feedback in SLA classroom research: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32, 265–302.

Macbeth, D. (2000) Classrooms as installations. In S. Hester and D. Francis (eds) *Local Educational Order* (pp. 21–71). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MacDonald, M.N., Badger, R. and Dasli, M. (2006) Authenticity, culture and language learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 6, 250–261.

Mackey, A., Abbuhl, R. and Gass, S.M. (2012) Interactionist approach. In S.M. Gass and A. Mackey (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 7–23). Abingdon: Routledge.

Majlesi, A.R. and Broth, M. (2012) Emergent learnables in Swedish as second language classroom interaction. *Language, Culture and Social Interaction* 1, 193–207.

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

Mushin, I. and Gardner, R. (2011) Silence is talk: Conversational silence in Australian Aboriginal talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 2033–2052.

Nguyen, H.t. (2012) *Developing Interactional Competence: A Conversation-analytic Study of Patient Consultations in Pharmacy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nguyen, H.t. and Kasper, G. (eds) (2009) *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual Perspectives.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Nishizaka, A. (1999) Doing interpreting within interaction: The interactive accomplishment of a 'henna gaijin' or 'strange foreigner'. *Human Studies* 22, 235–251.

Norton, B. (2000) *Identity and Language Learning.* Harlow: Longman/Pearson.

Okada, Y. (2015) Contrasting identities: A language teacher's practice in an English for specific purposes classroom. *Classroom Discourse* 6, 73–87.

Pallotti, G. and Wagner, J. (eds) (2011) *L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-analytic Perspective.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Perdue, C. (ed.) (1993) *Second Language Acquisition by Adult Immigrants. A Field Manual.* Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.

Pomerantz, A. (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation, Vols I and II.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. and 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.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.

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

Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1983) Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 137–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schmidt, R. (2001) Attention. In P. Robinson (ed.) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. and Frota, S.N. (1986) Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (ed.) *Talking to Learn* (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schumann, J. (1978) *The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sert, O. (2013) 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 45, 13–28.

Sert, O. and Walsh, S. (2013) The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education* 27, 542–565.

Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds) (2013) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L. and Steensig, J. (2011) Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds) *The Morality of Knowledge* (pp. 3–24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stokoe, E. (2012) Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies* 14, 277–303.

Streeck, J., Goodwin, C. and LeBaron, C. (eds) (2011) *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011a) Second language interaction for business and learning. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. Pekarek Doehler (eds) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development* (pp. 93–116). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011b) Language learning activities in real-life situations: Insisting on TCU completion in second language talk. In G. Pallotti and J. Wagner (eds) *L2 Learning as a Social Practice: Conversation-analytic Perspectives* (pp. 185–208). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Theodórsdóttir, G. and Eskildsen, S.W. (2011) The use of English in everyday Icelandic as a second language: Establishing intersubjectivity and doing learning. *Nordand Nordisk tidsskrift for andrespråksforskning* 6 (2), 59–85.

van Compernolle, R.A. (2010) Incidental microgenetic development in second-language teacher–learner talk-in-interaction. *Classroom Discourse* 1, 66–81.

Vance, T. (1987) *An Introduction to Japanese Phonology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wagner, J. (2016) Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno and S. W. Eskildsen (eds) *Usage-based Perspectives on Second Language Learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Young, R.F. and Miller, E.R. (2004) Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal* 88, 519–536.

Zimmerman, D. (1998) Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87–106). London: Sage.