Author(s): Piirainen-Marsh, Arja; Lilja, Niina

Title: Learning to Act in the Social World : Building Interactional Competence through Everyday Language Use Experiences

Year: 2022

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Please cite the original version:

Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Lilja, N. (2022). Learning to Act in the Social World : Building Interactional
Competence through Everyday Language Use Experiences. In H. Reinders, C. Lai, & P. Sundqvist
(Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of Language Learning and Teaching Beyond the Classroom (pp.
195-213). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003048169-17

Learning to act in the social world: building interactional competence through everyday language use experiences

Arja Piirainen-Marsh

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9898-3444

Niina Lilja

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0360-1584

Abstract

This chapter discusses how everyday interactions in second language speakers' daily life provide occasions for language learning and how language use experiences can be utilised in developing L2 pedagogy. It shows how the conversation analytical approach to language learning has reshaped understanding of objects of learning and the learning process. Empirical studied in this field illustrate how language learning materializes in contingent interaction in specific activities and their ecologies. We present examples of research-based pedagogical initiatives for supporting out-of-classroom learning and conclude by discussing future directions in the field.

Introduction

This chapter discusses how everyday interactions in second language speakers' daily life provide occasions for language learning and how language use experiences can be utilised in developing L2 pedagogy. Following the social turn in Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

research in the 1990s, there is now a large body of empirical research that scrutinises how second language development emerges from the co-constructed practices of social interaction in the learners' lifeworld. Our focus is on research that uses conversation analytic methods to build an empirically based understanding of language learning as situated social activity and achievement. Conversation analysis provides a unique theoretical and methodological framework for understanding the detailed ways in which social action is built and organized, moment-by-moment, by the participants in naturally occurring interaction. The goal of this chapter is twofold. First, it aims to shed light on the new insights that conversation analytic studies of language learning (CA-SLA) have provided into the understanding of second language learning and use as intricately linked to the resources through which social activities are built and organised (Kasper & Wagner 2014; Wagner 2015, Hellermann et al. 2019). Secondly, it discusses how conversation analytic insights can inform and provide a framework for developing second language teaching. To this end, we introduce and discuss examples of research-based practice that aims to support the development of interactional abilities by developing pedagogical procedures, materials and social infrastructures that create opportunities for participation in out-of-classroom interactions.

Conversation analytic research has provided new insights into the processes and outcomes of language learning by (1) redefining individualistic notions of cognition and competence as rooted in naturally occurring human social activity, (2) generating empirical analyses of learning-in-action in diverse linguistic, social and cultural settings both inside and outside the language classroom, and (3) informing the design of classroom activities and materials to support the development of learners' ability to act in the social world. In what follows, we first discuss how the underlying constructs of cognition and competence have been

respecified in conversation analytic research on language learning. After this, we focus on a selection of conversation analytic studies of language learning 'in the wild' and discuss how their results have been used in developing pedagogy for supporting the development of interactional competence. We conclude by addressing some implications for future research and practice.

Key constructs

In this section we discuss how the conversation analytic research has contributed to multidisciplinary SLA and language teaching (The Douglas Fir Group 2016) by respecifying key concepts used to understand L2 learning.

Cognition

From the outset, the conversation analytic approach to language learning has emphasized the social nature of learning to counter the strong cognitivist orientation in second language acquisition studies (Firth & Wagner 1997, 2007; Markee & Kasper 2004, Kasper & Wagner 2014). Conversation analytic research emphasizes the primacy of interaction as the bedrock of all social and cultural activity, and the natural environment for language use (Garfinkel 1967, Schegloff 1991, 2006). From this point of view, cognition is understood as a *socially shared* phenomenon, configured in and adaptive to social practices (Kasper 2009, Pekarek Doehler 2010). Language learning is a social endeavour, situated in the sense making practices that participants use in building intersubjectivity. It is the practical, hearable and visible procedures for co-constructing understanding, knowledge and mutual relationships that make language and culture learnable (Garfinkel & Sacks 1970).

The focus on action, context and naturally occurring interaction is consistent with the view that cognition is *situated* in practical activities in their sociocultural and material environments and *distributed* between human participants and the environment (Hutchins 1995). Hellermann (2018) argues for a holistic, action-based view that conceptualises cognition and learning as *enactivism*, that is "the dynamic interplay between mind, body, the environment and action" (p. 43). Aligned with research on distributed cognition and phenomenologically informed views of the self as a "dynamic, unbounded and shared entity" (Hellermann 2018: 42), this perspective looks at cognition as experienced practice. These views of cognition as situated and socially shared are often referred to as 4E cognition, emphasizing that cognition is (a) *extended*, in other words, uses affordances of artifacts in the environments (such as notebooks, computers), (b) *embedded*, that is situated in material environments, (c) *embodied* – bodily actions and functions influence mental functioning, and (d) *enacted* through agentive activity (Clark & Chalmers 1998, Atkinson 2010, 2019; Eilola & Lilja, 2021; Eskildsen & Markee, 2018). The work of Hutchins' (1995) and others on situated cognition informs research on language learning-in-action, which investigates how learning takes place and may be shaped by everyday social activities within specific material ecologies (Wagner 2015, 2019, Hellermann et al. 2019).

Learning in action

Conversation analytic research is grounded in an action-based view of language and learning (Pekarek Doehler 2010, Lee 2010, Lee & Hellermann 2014): language is seen as a constitutive part of larger ecologies of sociocultural activity and embedded in the activities that people conduct with others in their social world. Research focuses on those aspects of learning that are observable and analysable through detailed attention to the participants' sense-making practices and the procedures through which they manage their participation in

social activity. These include the linguistic, vocal and embodied practices of turn-construction and action formation, the moment-by-moment negotiation of turn transitions and accomplishment of sequences of action.

The commitment to trace the participants' displayed understandings of sequentially unfolding turns and actions has led to a reconsideration of what is learned in interaction and how. The focus of conversation analytic research is on the competencies and capacities that participants deploy – and learn to draw upon – in participating in social tasks. This entails a dialogic, usage-based and practical theory of language in which language and social activity are seen as mutually constitutive and language abilities are seen as intertwined with a wider set of competencies that enable individuals to engage in and manage social tasks (Eskildsen & Wagner 2015, Wagner 2015, 2019). These capacities and abilities are captured in the notion of interactional competence.

Interactional competence

The notion of interactional competence has been used in Applied Linguistics and CA-SLA since Claire Kramsch (1986) drew attention to the speaker-centred and restricted view of interaction represented in the "the proficiency movement" in the 1980s (for more detailed discussions tracing the history of the term see Hall 2018; Hall & Pekarek Doehler 2011; Salaberry & Kunitz 2019). More recently, the concept has been respecified in numerous publications documenting how L2 interactional abilities are displayed and developed in diverse activities and settings (Hall, Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger 2015, Skogmyr Marian & Balaman 2018). At the heart of the notion of interactional competence is the concern with the interacting parties' locally situated practices and their ability to build joint action (Pekarek Doehler 2019: 34, 38). It is this concern with

competence-in-action (Pekarek Doehler 2010) that distinguishes IC from other related, but more individually oriented concepts such as communicative competence (Hymes 1972).

From a conversation analytic viewpoint, interactional competence can be defined as the ability to build turns in a context-sensitive way to accomplish recognisable social actions and the ability to respond to the actions of others in situated interaction. This ability rests on the capacity to use and coordinate linguistic resources in the language user's repertoire, and other semiotic resources, such as gaze, gesture and meaningful objects, for joint action in the moment-by-moment unfolding of interaction. This means that interactional competence is dynamic and variable; it involves adaptation and recalibration of interactional resources for specific communicative needs both locally, in making one's utterance recognisable to the recipient, and more generally, when entering into new social engagements and participating in new kinds of communicative tasks (Pekarek Doehler 2019; Hellermann et al. 2019). Accordingly, the development of interactional competences can be seen as part of larger socialization processes through which second language users gain access to and learn to participate in the practices of a community and thereby may eventually be recognised as competent members in such communities.

Recent studies have called attention to a need to distinguish between the basic interactional capacities and language-specific resources that can be operationalised as objects of second language learning. Some have also proposed alternative terms such as interactional competencies (Kasper 2006), interactional practices (Waring 2018, 2019) and interactional repertoires (Hall 2018, 2019). Hall, for example, (2019) argues for using the term repertoire

to talk about objects of language learning, or language knowledge, defined as "conventionalised constellations of semiotic resources for taking action" (p. 86). By contrast, Hellermann (2018) and others (Wagner 2015, 2019, Koschmann 2013, Kasper & Wagner 2014) rely on the ethnomethodological understanding of competence as fundamentally interactional and inseparable from the accountable practices for accomplishing social action and ability to engage in interaction in specific contexts. From this point of view, the development of interactional competence involves developing alternative methods for organising social interaction such as turn-taking, repair, sequential organization and features of the structural organisation of interaction, as well as knowledge of how these may be adapted according to the local circumstances (Pekarek Doehler 2019: 29–30).

Empirical studies of interactional competence have covered a wide variety of methods for social action including linguistic practices such as the use of specific lexical features or grammatical constructions in interaction as well as methods for configuring interactional activities such as openings and closings, topic management, repair, disagreement, action sequencing and storytelling in different interactional settings (see Pekarek Doehler & Pochon Berger 2015 for overview). Overall, the notion of interactional competence or competencies captures the action-based approach to language learning informed by CA by emphasizing the emerging ability to adapt semiotic resources for action in a recipient-designed way and the development of interactional repertoires for context-sensitive social conduct (Eskildsen 2018, Pekarek Doehler 2019).

Key issues

In this section, we discuss current issues faced by researchers and practitioners who work towards developing a research-based framework for supporting language learning in the wild.

How do everyday interactions create occasions for learning?

A growing body of empirical research demonstrates the rich learning potential of everyday encounters for language learning. Two strands can be identified in this research. One group of studies focuses on learning as social activity, in other words pays detailed attention to moments where the participants make learning a focal concern in interaction (Koschmann 2013, Kasper & Wagner 2014). Another group of studies uses longitudinal data to trace observable changes in L2 speakers' methods for participation in social activity across short or longer time spans (see Pekarek Doehler et al. 2018).

Studies that focus on learning as social activity shed light on learning as a locally occasioned phenomenon that is publicly displayed in the participants' conduct. They demonstrate, for example, how participants momentarily depart from advancing the main line of talk to initiate repair, carry out word searches or focus on the form or meaning of expressions used in prior talk or otherwise observable in the environment (see e.g. Brouwer 2003, Kurhila 2006, Greer 2013, Lilja 2014, Kasper & Burch 2016; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir 2017, Theodórsdóttir 2011, 2018, Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh 2019a, 2019b). These studies make visible how language learning activities are embedded in social interaction in a variety of everyday and workplace settings. Kasper and Burch (2016), for example, show how participants in an everyday conversation create a space for learning by shifting the topical focus from everyday matters to language form in order to address a lexical understanding problem and fill a gap in the vocabulary of a L2 speaker of Japanese. Their detailed multimodal analysis demonstrates how this shift to 'focus on form' generates sustained attention to a learning object and involves word definitions, form practice as well as attending to a problem concerning writing the character of a synonym. The study highlights the way that the social organisation of the

activity enables joint attentional focus on a learning object and augments the L2 speaker's knowledge of linguistic resources, but also makes relevant social relations, in this case 'doing friendship'. Eskildsen and Theodórsdóttir (2017) describe how a Canadian student at Iceland University makes relevant her identity as a second language speaker in everyday service encounters and initiates negotiation for a 'contract' to speak Icelandic with the co-participant. Studies of learning activity in workplace contexts are still scarce. A few existing studies show that interactional competence is closely intertwined with the work practices of different professions. Kurhila and Lehtimaja (2019a) analyse language use contexts that are typical in nurses' work in hospitals. Their analysis shows that language use in these contexts is situated and tightly connected with nurses' professional expertise (see also Kurhila & Lehtimaja 2019b). In a study focusing on a migrant worker's interaction in Norwegian as L2 at a construction site, Svennevig (2017) demonstrates how the participants expand a word search sequence beyond identification of the sought for word and thereby orient to the word as a learnable. Learning activity involves repetition and checking the perception of the words and rehearsing pronunciation.

While early studies of such learning behaviours (Markee 2008) largely focus on repair, recent research draws attention to a range of other features, such as referential practices (Kim 2012), noticings (Greer 2019, Eskildsen 2019) and reindexing previously learned items (Eskildsen 2018, 2019, see also Jakonen 2018) as local resources in learning activity. Greer (2019) shows how participants in L2 interaction orient to learning in sequences where they notice and pay explicit attention to new lexical items that occur in the preceding talk or are visible in the physical environment. His multimodal analysis of two distinct cases (a Japanese student interacting with the American host family and a Bolivian man having a haircut in a Japanese hair salon) shows how noticing of a lexical item in interaction can occasion episodes of talk

where the participants put the projected trajectory of talk 'on hold' and engage in extended sequences where the noticed items are explained and later re-indexed as recently learned items. The analysis demonstrates how noticings enable the participants to resolve epistemic asymmetries and provide occasions for L2 learners to gain access to new language resources by making use of the expert speakers and assigning them with teacher-like qualities (Greer 2019: 144).

In sum, studies of mundane interactions in out-of-classroom environments provide empirical insight into the practices that participants deploy to establish spaces for learning, focus joint attention to language forms, solicit assistance from language experts, and engage in sequences where new objects of learning are examined, clarified, explained and co-constructed as learned or understood. Many of the observed practices are similar to those identified in research on classroom interaction and show how everyday interactions can involve pedagogical sequences where the participants orient to roles of novice and expert language user. However, they also suggest how language learning in the wild differs from classroom learning. Pekarek Doehler (2019; see also Pekarek Doehler & Berger 2018; Berger & Pekarek Doehler 2018), for example shows how and L2 speaker of French, who had participated in L2 instruction for 12 years, developed a more varied interactional repertoire of resources in storytelling and was able to deploy these resources in a more context-sensitive way after only two months of homestay in the L2 environment. These and related findings point to the limitations of the classroom as a learning environment and the lack of attention to interactional features in L2 curricula. Recent studies also draw attention to the material environment as a resource for learning activity. Greer (2019) describes how a novice speaker's articulated noticing of an unfamiliar word used about an object in the environment makes public his own hypothesis of the meaning of a lexical item, which leads to an

explanation sequence where the participants address different uses of the same word. As he observes, "opportunities to make inferences about incidental language use in relation to description of environmental objects can be limited or at best, artificial" in the classroom (p. 155).

The role of environment and activity-relevant objects for second language use and learning is also illustrated in extract 1 from a cooking class. As the main activities in the class are cooking and baking, the participants' attention is usually not focused on language. Sometimes, however, language-related noticings are occasioned in the middle of these practical activities. In extract 1 Ali (L2 speaker of Finnish) is guided by Tea (L1 speaker of Finnish) in making cookie dough. While Ali is whisking sugar and butter with a hand-held electric mixer, Tea describes what the dough should be like as a result of the whisking: it should become foam-like (l. 1–2).

Extract 1) Vaahto (foam)

```
+= TEA's gestures
*= ALI's gestures


01 TEA    +siitä pitää saada sem+mosta
           it needs to be made into such like
          +raises right hand to chest level
                            +moves fingers->

02          >ninku< (.)+ vaah*#too, *(.)
              like  (.)  foam
                  -->+opens fingers, open palm->
     ali                *gazes to teacher,
                          nods *gaze back to bowl->
                         #pic 1

03          [vaahto (.) tiedätkö mitä on+
             foam       know-SG2-CLI what is
             foam (.) do you know what is
                                  -->+

04 ALI    [sama #*krema (.) krema (ker-)
           same "krema" (.) "krema" (cre-)
                *gaze to teacher->
```

```
                    #pic 2

05 TEA    =+aaam
          +starts to close and open fingers->

06        (.)

07 ALI    sama kre[ma
          same "krema"

08 TEA           [foam #(.) *joo (.)+ joo (.)
                   "foam"(.) yes (.) yes
                              -->+
   ali                   *gaze back to bowl
                    #pic3

09        vaahtoo (.) joo (4.0) voit laittaa
          foam    (.) yes (4.0) you can speed it up

10        kove+mmalle sitte ku se on semmosta
          when it is like that
```

< Insert Figure 1 here >

Figure 1. Graphic transcript of Extract 1.

Concurrently with her verbal turn Tea produces a depictive gesture with her right hand as if squeezing something soft in it. She also stresses the first syllable of the word foam (vaahto) (l. 2). Together the gesture and the stress as well as the turn-final position make the word *vaahto* salient in TEA's turn. Simultaneously with ALI's embodied response, Tea continues by directly asking Ali whether he knows what foam means (l. 3). Tea thus orients to the word *foam* as potentially new to Ali. Ali gazes towards Tea and reacts to her instruction by asking whether *vaahto* is the same as *krema,* a word that is not standard Finnish but is recognizable as referring to cream. By seeking confirmation for his understanding of TEA's instruction Ali orients to maintaining mutual understanding of what the dough-in-the making should become like but also makes a connection between an unfamiliar and familiar vocabulary item. The activity and the objects that enable the whisking thus afford

possibilities for language-related talk intertwined with the ongoing larger baking activity. A key question to be addressed in future research is how occasions for similar learning activities arise in different types of social activity and their material ecologies.

CA research highlights how spatial, material and temporal features of practical activities contextualise interaction and create specific kinds of affordances for action. Recent work on objects and mobility in interaction (Haddington et al. 2013, Nevile et al. 2014), for example, show how practices of turn-taking and action formation are sensitive to changes in the physical or spatial environments. So far only a few studies of L2 interaction have considered how the participants' interaction with the environment figures in their interaction and affordances for learning. Hellermann et al. (2019) analyse language learners engaged in playing a place-based augmented reality game in an attempt to explore how their action is "situated in, or catalyzed by, particular aspects of the physical surround and how this might be relevant for language learning" (p. 194). Their focus is on the participants' methods for making unplanned use of resources of the physical context in brainstorming how to accomplish game goals. Their analysis shows how the participants draw on the multiple semiotic fields and a rich array of meaning-making resources in managing the task. For example, written instructions in the game on the mobile device are referred to and understood with respect to salient objects in the physical environment. The participants draw on talk and embodied activity to index features of the environment and make them relevant to their activities. One of the key issues to address in future research is to develop a better understanding of the ways in which participants mobilize features of the physical environment in interaction and how this can create affordances for language learning.

A growing number of studies draw on longitudinal data and methods of vertical comparison in Conversation Analysis (Kasper & Wagner 2014) to investigate the development of interactional competence by documenting observable changes in the methods for participation in social activity over time. While the focus has been mostly on instructional settings, increasing attention has been paid to mundane and work settings, including study abroad, homestay contexts and business communication. Longitudinal studies describe changes in the use of L2 linguistic (lexical and syntactic) resources which point to an expanding repertoire of resources and the development of grammar-for-interaction (see e.g. Ishida 2009, Hauser 2013, Pekarek Doehler & Berger 2019). Another group of studies focus on changes in sequential patterns or overall structural organisation of interaction. In a pioneering study Brouwer and Wagner (2004) demonstrated how a second language speaker's practices of opening a business telephone conversation change over the course of three telephone calls in consecutive days. Their analysis shows how the initially disorderly openings are managed in a more coordinated way in later calls, demonstrating the routinization of the social practice of business call openings as well as the evolving social relationship between the participants. In a study focusing on pharmacy consultations, Ngyen (2012, 2018) documents how patterns of action sequencing, topic management and the design of formulations change over time. A few studies shed light on changes in storytelling practices in everyday conversations in a family setting. Barraja-Rohan (2015) reports how a Japanese student's storytelling practices show increasing complexity and evidence of new interactional resources during a 19-week stay in Australia. Kim (2016) shows how a Korean student's recipient conduct manifests widening of resources and more timely and sequentially appropriate deployment of these resources. Two studies focusing on openings (Pekarek Doehler and Berger 2018) and practices for bringing the story to a climax and close (Berger and Pekarek Doehler 2018) demonstrate how the storytelling practices of an L2 speaker of

French become more attuned to the recipients and more context-sensitive over time. These studies lend support to an understanding of interactional competence as involving diversification of practices for participating in interaction and increased ability for context-sensitive conduct (Pekarek Doehler 2019).

To summarise, studies of learning activity shed light on social and situated occasions for learning by elucidating how participants in diverse environments outside the classroom make learning a focal concern in interaction. They show how components of social action – including language practices – are made publicly available for learning. In this way, they increase understanding of learning and teaching as "built into the organization of interaction itself" (Goodwin (2018: 102). Although research in this area is accumulating, there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed in future work. One issue that has bearing on both theory and praxis concerns the interrelationship between linguistic resources as part of an individual's interactional repertoire and the holistic understanding of interactional competence as the ability to deploy multiple semiotic resources for action in diverse social activities. This calls for more systematic research on grammar as a set of resources in L2 interaction and the developmental trajectories through which L2 grammar for interaction emerges. Promising steps to this direction have already been taken in studies combining conversation analysis with usage-based linguistics or interactional linguistics (Eskildsen 2018, Pekarek Doehler 2018, Pekarek Doehler & Berger 2019). Another challenge is to broaden the empirical basis of research by investigating affordances of action and learning in a wider array of social activities in the L2 speakers' lifeworld. As learning is embedded in practical activities that are embedded in larger ecologies, studies of L2 interaction need to develop a richer understanding of the practices used in different sociomaterial environments.

In addition, longitudinal research is needed to get deeper insight into the factors that impact the development of interactional competence as a social process.

How can research-based insights be applied in designing pedagogical practice?

The study of language learning as embedded in interactions with others has opened up new possibilities for developing L2 instruction by designing materials for teaching interactional competence (Huth 2006, Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm 2006, Wong & Waring 2010; Barraja-Rohan 2011, Wong 2011, Betz & Huth 2014, Kurhila & Kotilainen 2020). This means focusing on interactionally defined objects of learning such as openings and closings of telephone calls, requests and compliments as well as practices of turn-taking and active listenership. Waring (2018, 2019) adopts the conversation analytic concept of interactional practices as a starting point for developing a model for understanding such practices as pedagogical objects. She argues that practices of turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring and repair can be taught by designing classroom activities around recordings of naturally occurring interaction and transcripts of these. A more programmatic and systematic effort to develop research-based pedagogical practice was carried out at the Centre for Language and Intercultural Communication (CLIC) at Rice University, where a group of teachers and researchers collaborated to create units of instruction for a curriculum based on interactional competence (Salaberry & Kunitz 2019). Kunitz and Yeh (2019) describe the steps taken to design instructional materials and discuss the outcomes of a pedagogical intervention aimed at developing the participants' interactional competence in Chinese as a foreign language. The specific focus was on developing practices for active listenership and topic management. They show how a pedagogical cycle consisting of different phases in which students analyse sequences of talk, practice specific learning targets, and reflect on the import of what they

have learned, can be used in raising students' awareness of the practices and skills involved. This work illustrates how a research-based understanding of interactional competence can serve as a useful framework for increasing teachers' and students' awareness of the richness of interaction and for designing materials, teaching strategies and tasks that foster students' participation in interaction. The limitation is that while emphasizing the richness of authentic interaction and details of interactional practices as targets of learning, much of this work focuses on the classroom as the main learning environment.

By contrast, researchers in the language learning in the wild network have argued for more radical changes to teaching of second languages. Wagner (2015) argues for developing a new kind of experiential pedagogy that centres around social encounters that people living in a L2 environment participate in and integrates the learners' experiences of these encounters into pedagogical activities. Two pioneering initiatives to support L2 learning in the wild were carried out in Iceland and Sweden. In Iceland, Gudrun Theodórsdóttir and others created social infrastructures for learning by making agreements with local businesses that enabled novice L2 learners to use Icelandic in actual business encounters in a supportive environment (Theodórsdóttir and Wagner 2013, Wagner 2015). In Sweden, the Språkskap project brought together researchers, language teachers and interaction designers to develop a framework and material resources to support learners in their interactions outside the classroom. For example, they created materials to guide L2 speakers in mapping their arenas for language use and to support planning interactions to be carried out in the wild and reflecting on them (Clark & Lindemalm 2011, Clark et al. 2011). In Finland, CA researchers and interaction designers collaborated with language teachers in order to develop tangible materials and experientially based pedagogical practices that would help students extend the spaces for

learning, augment their resources for participating in interaction in their social world, and support reflection on their language use experiences. Lilja et al. (2019) provide a detailed description of the structure of the "Rally course", some of the materials used, and the pedagogical process. The materials guided the students to reflect on their needs, goals and opportunities for interaction in the second language, to set challenges and plan their own learning journeys. The students were familiarized with a pedagogic cycle that involved "scouting", that is observing interactions in the wild, preparing for interactions in chosen settings, recording their interactions using their smartphones and reflecting on their language use experiences in 'debriefing activities' (Wagner 2015) in the classroom. When complementary data sets from classroom discussions and the students' self-recorded interactions were analysed in detail, it was found that the debriefing discussions created opportunities for reflecting and analysing prior language use experiences at several levels. In addition to enabling discussion of objects of learning (ranging from lexical and syntactic to sequential phenomena) identified by the learners themselves, they generated extended discussions focusing on cultural norms and practices (Piirainen-Marsh & Lilja 2019). In addition, they showed that the smartphone as a personal device enabled language-focused activity in which students scrutinized moments that they found noteworthy or problematic (Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh 2019a, 2019b).

Extract 2 (analysed in more detail in Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh 2019b) illustrates how the smart phone works as a central resource in an extended language-focused activity which is occasioned by Mark's telling about his service encounter in a café. Prior to the extract Mark has explained that he had difficulties in understanding the clerk's answer to his question about the whether or not he was expected to pay for a hot chocolate he ordered. This generates a sharing activity, in which the participants watch the video multiple times and collectively work to construct a hearing and understanding of the clerk's answer.

Extract 2) The smartphone as a resource for learning activity

```
34          *∆ #(0.4) (0.6)
   mar   ->*puts the phone on the table so that it is visible to everyone,
                 leans towards it->
   joh   ->∆gaze towards phone->
             #pic 1


35 VID    (ok)ei maksaa?
          Okey it costs


36 JOH    ∆^ei [maksa                    ^
            NEG cost-STEM/pay-STEM
          ^points towards the teacher^
          ∆gaze towards the teacher->


37 MAR         [*+ei maksa?#
                  NEG cost-STEM/pay-STEM
               ->*raises position->
                ->+gaze towards teacher->
                         #pic 2


38 VID    opiskelija?
          student?


39 JOH    see?


40         +(.)
   mar   ->+gaze towards phone->


41 JOH    ∆^put it a little bit back^#
       ->∆gaze towards the phone ->
            ^points towards the phone^
                              #pic3


42         *(.)
   mar     *leans towards phone, handles phone and rewinds the video ->


43 CLA    ei maksaa >maybe<
          NEG cost-INF / pay-INF


44 MAR    we- we'll see when she goes [back, #(.)
                                            #pic 4


45 TEA                                  [ah:


46         se oli ehkä <ei> (.) maksaa:
                        NEG    cost-INF/pay-INF
            it was maybe no  (.) it costs


47         (.)


48 CLA    aah


49 MAR    *now she goes back (.) to ask #
       ->*point towards phone->
                         #pic5
```

< Insert Figure 2 here >

Figure 2. Graphic transcript of Extract 2.

In the beginning of the extract Mark places the phone in the middle of the table for all the participating students to see and starts to play the video (line 34, pic 1). When the clerk's focal answer is hearable, both John and Mark repeat it and Mark directs his gaze towards the teacher as if seeking for her confirmation (line 36, pic 2). Another student, John, asks Mark to replay the answer (line 41, pic 3). While Mark is handling the phone, two other participants, Claire and the teacher, suggest alternative ways of hearing the clerk's turn (lines 43, 46). Mark rewinds the video to moments before the focal response and plays it again, concurrently commenting on what happens on the video while the other participants are watching (pic 4 and 5). After hearing the target turn, the participants again engage with it by repeating the focal answer and clarifying its meaning. This short fragment of the extended activity illustrates how the smart phone as a technological device connects the classroom with the world outside by allowing the participants to retrieve prior language use experiences for retrospective reflection and analysis. The sharing and collective watching of the video enables the participants to co-construct a new understanding of the situation in a way that would not be possible without the recording. As shown in the example, in the classroom the students can also turn to the teacher's expertise in trying to make sense of the turns that have cause them trouble in understanding.

The pedagogical initiatives briefly described above answer the call for developing L2 pedagogy that takes social interaction as its starting point and center on supporting the L2

speakers' participation and learning from interactions in their life world. Researchers and practitioners face the challenge of designing tools that support L2 users' participation in interactions outside the classroom and creating spaces for 'harvesting' (Wagner 2015) their experiences.

Implications and future directions

The research discussed above has increased theoretical understanding of interactional competence, provided insights into the in-situ learning activities that are embedded in L2 interactions outside the classroom, and shed light on developmental trajectories by documenting changes in L2 speakers' interactional practices. However, there are still significant gaps in research that need to be addressed to better understand what kinds of infrastructures and pedagogical practices best support the development of interactional competence. There is a need for further development of the programme on language learning in action that pays systematic attention to the following issues : a) conceptualisation of linguistic competencies as part of interactional competence, b) the tension between conceptualization of IC as locally achieved, co-constructed and situated, and the need to study the emergence of interactional resources in L2 development, and c) the need for a holistic multimodal framework to account for the complexly intertwined resources that participants draw upon to accomplish action. As discussed in previous studies (Pekarek Doehler 2019, Ngyen 2019), this also calls for methodological development. It is important to broaden the data base by addressing a wider variety of social activities that L2 speakers participate in their social world. More video-based research is needed to find out about learning opportunities and affordances in workplace interaction, for example. Studies of L2

interaction in the wild also need to refine procedures for systematic analysis and comparison of interactional practices across settings and over time.

An ongoing challenge for researchers and practitioners concerned with supporting the development of IC is the "teachability" of interactional practices. In order to usefully inform pedagogical practice, further efforts are needed to increase awareness of generic organizations of interaction and the detailed practices that these involve among teachers and practitioners. As empirical studies from diverse activities and ecologies accumulate, these can inform our understanding of the ways that interactional competencies are adapted to specific environments and how the participants mobilise linguistic and embodied resources as well as features of the environment in organizing action. Research-based insights are needed to develop infrastructures that widen L2 learners' opportunities for participation in social activity outside the classroom and design materials and support-structures that help them navigate the interactions in their social world.

Reflection questions

1. In your experience, what are the most important aspects of second language use that can be learned from everyday interactions?
2. What are the advantages of respecifying the object of language learning as interactional competence? What are the advantages of using alternative terms such as interactional interactional repertoires?
3. To what extent is interactional competence teachable? What kind of pedagogy, in your opinion, would best support the development of L2 interactional competence?

Recommended reading

1. Wagner, Johannes (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning.

This article discusses how an action-based view of language can inform the teaching of languages. It argues for redefining language learning as "the range of social possibilities the new language will afford which includes the linguistic competence needed to realize these possibilities" (p 76). The article outlines the basis for experiential pedagogy that centers around the L2 users' encounters in their lifeworld. The role of teaching in this approach is to prepare L2 users for these encounters, furnish them with helpful tools and materials, and provide spaces for reflection and understanding of their experiences.

2. Salaberry, M. R., & Kunitz, S. (Eds.) (2019). *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*.

This volume presents a selection of research on L2 interactional competence and its pedagogical implications. The book is structured into four sections. After a thorough introduction to the concept of IC, the chapters discuss theoretical and methodological issues (Section 1), research-based insights on teaching (Section 2), research-informed pedagogy (Part III) and testing interactional competence (IV).

3. Eskildsen, S., Pekarek Doehler, S, Piirainen-Marsh, A. & Hellermann, J. (Eds.) (2019). Introduction: on the complex ecology of language learning in the wild.

This collection of articles introduces conversation analytic research on language learning outside instructional settings. The articles discuss the complex ecology of second language

interactions in a variety of settings ranging from everyday conversation to service encounters and technology-supported place-based games.

References

Atkinson, D. (2010). Extended, embodied cognition and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 599–622.

Atkinson, D. (2011). Introduction: cognitivism and second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 1–23). Oxford: Routledge.

Atkinson, D. (2019). Beyond the brain: intercorporeality and co-operative action for SLA studies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(4), 724–738.
DOI: 10.1111/modl.125950026-7902/19/724–738

Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*,15, 479–507.

Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (2015). ”I told you”. Storytelling development of a Japanese learning English as a second language. In T. Cadierno & S.W. Eskildsen (Eds.) *Usage-Based Perspectives on Second Language Learning* (pp. 271–304). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Betz, E. & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German classroom. *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42(2), 140–163.

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

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

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis,* 58(1), 7–19.

Clark, B. & K. Lindemalm (2011). *Språkskap - Swedish as a Social Language*. Ergonomidesign, Folkeuniversitetet & Interactive Institute.

Clark, B. Wagner, J. Lindemalm, K. & Bendt, O. (2011). Språkskap: Supporting second language learning 'in the wild'. *INCLUDE* 11. International conference on inclusive design proceedings. London, Royal College of Art.

The Douglas Fir Group (2016). A Transdisciplinary Framework for SLA in a Multilingual World. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100 (Supplement 2016), 19–47. DOI: 10.1111/modl.123010026-7902/16/19–47

Eilola, L. & Lilja N. (2021). The Smartphone as a Personal Cognitive Artifact Supporting Participation in Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal* 105 (1), 294–316.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: Interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 68–76.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal, 102* (Supplement), 3–10.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Markee, N. (2018). L2 talk as social accomplishment. In R. A. Alonso (Ed.), *Learning to speak in an L2* (pp. 69–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eskildsen, S. & Wagner, J. (2015). Embodied L2 construction learning. *Language Learning, 65*(2), 419–448.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2018a). From trouble in the talk to new resources – The interplay of bodily and linguistic resources in the talk of a speaker of English as a second language. In S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner, & E. González-Martínez (Eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 143–171). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 800–819.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

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

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

Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 100–117.

Greer, T. (2019). Noticing words in the wild. In J. Hellermann, S.W. Eskildsen, S., Pekarek Doehler & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.) *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action. The Complex Ecology of Second Language Interaction 'in the wild'* (pp. 131–158), Cham: Springer.

Haddington, P. et al. 2013, Haddington, P. Mondada, L. & Nevile, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Interaction and Mobility. Language and the body in motion*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Hall, J.K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 25–39.

Hall, J.K. (2019). The Contributions of Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics to a Usage-Based Understanding of Language: Expanding the Transdisciplinary Framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103 (Supplement 2019), 80–94. DOI: 10.1111/modl.125350026-7902/19/80–94

Hall, J.K., Hellermann, J. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.) (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hauser, E. (2013). Stability and change in one adult's second language English negation. *Language Learning, 63*(3): 463–498.

Hellermann, J. (2018). Languaging as competencing: Considering language learning as enactment. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 40−56.

Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S., Pekarek Doehler, S. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. eds. (2019). *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action. The Complex Ecology of Second Language Interaction 'in the wild'*. Cham: Springer.

Hellermann, J., Thorne, S. & Haley, J. (2019). Building socio-environmental infrastructures for learning. In J. Hellermann, S.W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.). *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action. The Complex Ecology of Second Language Interaction 'in the wild'* (pp. 193–218). Cham: Springer.

Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*, 2025-2050.

Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research, 10*, 53–79.

Hymes, D.H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

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

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. 351-386). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.

Jakonen, Teppo (2018) Retrospective orientation to learning activities and achievements as a resource in classroom interaction. *The Modern Language Journal,* 102(4), 758–774.

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

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

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117–142). New York: Routledge.

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

Kim, Y. (2012). Practices for initial recognitional reference and learning opportunities in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 44, 709–729.

Kim, Y. (2016). Development of L2 interactional competence: being a story recipient in L2 English conversation. *Discourse and Cognition*, 23(1), 1–29.

Koschmann, T. (2013). Conversation analysis and learning in interaction. In K. Mortensen & J. Wagner (Eds.), Conversation Analysis. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), The *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1038 – 1043).

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

Kramsch, C. (Ed.) (2000). *Language acquisition and language socialization: ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.

Kunitz, S. & Yeh, Y. (2019). Instructed L2 interactional competence in the first year. In M.R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence. Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 228–259). New York/London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

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

Kurhila, S. & Kotilainen, L. (2020). Student-initiated language learning sequences in a real-world digital environment. *Linguistics and Education,* 56, 1–11.

Kurhila, S. & Lehtimaja, I. (2019). Ammattikielen tilanteisuus kielenoppimisen haasteena: esimerkkinä hoitoala. In L. Kotilainen, S. Kurhila, & J. Kalliokoski (Eds.), *Kielenoppiminen luokan ulkopuolella* (pp. 143–171). Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

Kurhila, S. & Lehtimaja, I. (2019). Dealing with numbers: Nurses informing doctors and patients about test results. *Discourse Studies*, *21*(2), 180–198. doi.org/10.1177/1461445618802662

Lee, Y. (2010). Learning in the contingency of talk-in-interaction. *Text and Talk*, 30, 403–22. doi: 10.1515/text.2010.020

Lee, Y. & Hellermann, J. (2014) Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis. Cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis. *TESOL Quarterly,* 48(4), 763–788.

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

Lilja, N. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2019a). Connecting the language classroom and the wild: Reenactments of language use experiences. *Applied Linguistics, 40*, 594–623.

Lilja, N. & Piirainen-Marsh, A (2019b). Making sense of interactional trouble through mobile supported sharing activities. In M. R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 260–289). New York/London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Lilja, N., Piirainen-Marsh, A., Clark, B. & Torretta, N. (2019). Learners as co-designers of out-of-classroom language learning tasks. In J. Hellermann, S.W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action. The complex ecology of second language interaction 'in the wild'* (pp. 219–248). Cham: Springer.

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

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(3), 404–427.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (2004). The special issue: Classroom talks. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*, 491–500.

Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T. & Rauniomaa, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Interacting with Objects: Language, materiality, and social activity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

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

Nguyen, H. (2018). A longitudinal perspective on turn design: From role-plays to workplace patient consultations. In S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner E., & González-Martínez (Eds.), *Documenting change across time: longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 195–224). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Nguyen, H. T. (2019). Conclusion: deepening roots and broadening horizons in interactional competence research and praxis. In M. R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 397–412). New York/London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'Learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2019). On the nature and the development of L2 interactional competence: state of the art and implications for praxis. In R. Salaberry, & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 25-59). New York/London: Routledge.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 555–578. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021.

Pekarek Doehler, S., Wagner, J. & González-Martínez, E. (Eds.) (2018). *Documenting change across time: longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Piirainen-Marsh, Arja & Lilja, Niina (2019) How wild can it get? Managing language learning tasks in real life service encounters. In J. Hellermann, S.W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action. The Complex Ecology of Second Language Interaction 'in the Wild'* (pp. 161–192). Cham: Springer.

Salaberry, M. R., & Kunitz, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*. New York/London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Schegloff, E. (1991). Conversation Analysis and socially shared cognition. In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, & S.D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp.150–171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Skogmyr Marian, K. & Balaman, U. (2018) Second language interactional competence and its development. An overview of conversation analytic research on interactional change over time. *Language & Linguistics Compass,* 12(8), 1–16.

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

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2011). Second language interaction for business and learning. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 56–93). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Wagner, J. (2018). Multilingual and multimodal interactions. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1), 99–107.

Wagner, J. (2019). Towards an Epistemology of Second Language Learning in the Wild. In Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S., Pekarek Doehler, S. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (Eds.), *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action* (pp. 251–271). Cham: Springer.

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

Waring, H. Z. (2019). Developing interactional competence with limited linguistic resources. In In R. Salaberry, & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 215–227). New York/London: Routledge.

Wong, J. & Waring, H.Z. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and second language pedagogy: a gudie for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Wong, J. (2011). Pragmatic competency in telephone conversation openings. In N.R. Houck & D.H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: teaching natural conversation* (pp. 119–134). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.

List of contributors

Arja Piirainen-Marsh is Professor of English at the Department of Language and Communication Studies, University of Jyväskylä. Her research focuses on social interaction in second language and multilingual settings.

ORCID 0000-0001-9898-3444

Niina Lilja is a Lecturer of Finnish at the University of Tampere. Her areas of expertise include Conversation Analysis, learning in interaction (CA-SLA, Finnish as a second language and learning in the wild.

ORCID 0000-0003-0360-1584