

“What’s it called in Norwegian?”

Acquiring L2 vocabulary items in the workplace

Abstract

The article describes a conversational practice used by L2 speakers in acquiring new technical terms in the course of everyday workplace interaction on a construction site. In the process of searching for a word, the speaker identifies a referent by embodied means and asks the L1 interlocutor what it is called in Norwegian. When the term is provided, it is repeated, often with emphatic prosody, displaying the L2 speaker’s identification of the word and ability to pronounce it. This repeat is treated as a request for confirmation by the L1 speaker, who often also provides further repeats of the word in question. By expanding the word search sequence beyond the identification of the word searched for, the participants show an orientation to the word as a learnable, that is, as something to be memorized and rehearsed in the conversation. The activity of teaching and learning technical vocabulary is thus treated as a relevant activity in and of itself, at the expense of the progression of the workplace task at hand.

Keywords: workplace interaction; second language acquisition; second language interaction; repetition; word search sequences; learnables

Introduction

Extensive work migration in present-day Europe has led to a situation where many workplaces involve employees with different first languages. Communication will thus frequently be conducted in a language that is a second or foreign language to one or several speakers. In white-collar workplaces English is often chosen as the lingua franca, but in blue-collar workplaces this is not always the case. This article is a study of how a Polish construction worker uses Norwegian in communication with his leaders and co-workers. He has only had very rudimentary formal training in Norwegian, and thus has mainly learnt to speak Norwegian merely by interacting with colleagues at work. He is thus a good candidate for studying processes of language learning ‘in the wild’, that is, outside of organized pedagogical activities (Wagner 2015).

Since Firth & Wagner's (1997) call for more research on the characteristics of L2 interaction as a topic in its own right, there has been a growing interest in how second language speakers orient to language learning in everyday conversations outside the classroom (*e.g.* Brouwer 2003, 2004, Kurhila 2006, Hosoda 2006, Theodórsdóttir 2011, Kim 2012, Lilja 2014, Wagner 2015). This study contributes to this line of research and expands it by investing a new type of data from a multilingual workplace. Most studies referred to above describe practices of language students in their extracurricular activities. The current study focusses on a migrant worker who does not attend language classes and thus has workplace interaction as his main source of language learning.

Observing how language learning happens in the wild is challenging since most lingua franca speakers in the workplace tend to avoid 'flagging' problems and instead let mistakes pass without correcting them (Firth 1996, Wagner & Firth 1997). Thus, language issues seldom surface in such conversations. However, in some cases, interlocutors do orient to missing words as 'learnables', that is, as words to be acquired for future reference rather than just being identified and used for the communicative purpose at hand. According to Majlesi & Broth (2012), the orientation to a lexical item as a learnable emerges interactionally when one party enquires about the meaning of a word used or the name a referent in the physical surround and thereby displays his or her lack of linguistic knowledge. If the knowing interlocutors respond with a metalinguistic explanation, they enter into a side sequence where the pedagogical activity of learning a new word becomes temporarily the focus of attention.

This article focuses on one practice used in orienting to a new lexical item as a learnable. The practice involves cases where the speaker, due to a lack of words in Norwegian, identifies a referent by embodied means (gestures, object manipulation) and asks his interlocutor what it is called in Norwegian. This practice is based on the format of word search sequences (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986), but it also differs from it in certain respects. The main difference is that the sequence is systematically expanded by repeat sequences. The article argues that these repeat sequences manifest an orientation to the pedagogical activity of teaching and learning a new word.

The article first presents the features of word search sequences in general and how such sequences have been studied in L2 interaction. Then I present the data used in the study, before I turn to the analysis of extracts that illustrate the orientation to teaching and learning new words in word search sequences.

Word search sequences

Word search sequences start by a speaker displaying problems in continuing or completing an ongoing turn at talk. This may be indexed by intra-turn pauses and by speech perturbations such as hesitation markers (*uh*) and sound stretches (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977). There may also be embodied displays of trouble, such as putting up a 'thinking face' (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986) or grasping in the air (McNeill 1992). Even explicit verbal indications of trouble may be produced, such as "what's it called" or "how do you say it".

These verbal or gestural prompts are sometimes recognizably self-directed, such as when speakers are searching for a name or a word that they do not expect their interlocutors to have access to. The solitary nature of the search may be displayed by keeping the gaze away from the interlocutor or by speaking in low volume. On other occasions, speakers may on the contrary direct their gaze at their interlocutor, and thereby seek to recruit them to participate in the search activity (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986).

In the course of appealing for assistance, speakers may provide clues as to what they are searching for, such as giving examples, paraphrasing, explaining, code-switching etc. (Kurhila 2006, Greer 2013). Speakers may also give clues by means of gestures, such as *illustrating* the referent by means of iconic gestures or *indicating* it by means of deictic gestures such as pointing (Hayashi 2003, Park 2007, Greer 2013). Finally, the type of lexical item being searched for may be indexed by various verbal elements produced prior to the search activity, such as articles, demonstratives and other function words that project a word of a certain grammatical category (Hayashi 2003).

Word searches may be resolved in two ways, either by the speakers themselves finding the word searched for (or some equivalent) or by the interlocutor proposing a candidate solution. Candidate words may be produced with falling or rising intonation, signaling varying degrees of epistemic commitment to the solution proposed (Park 2007). The candidate solution will then be either accepted or rejected by the speaker. Acceptance is often signaled by repeating the suggested word and adding a confirmation token (Kim 2012). Sometimes the word is also integrated in the completion of the original utterance-in-progress (Lerner 1996).

A collaborative word search sequence thus consists of three parts. First, the trouble source turn, where the speaker displays problems finding a word and possibly also appeals to the interlocutor for assistance. Second, the proposal of a candidate

solution by the interlocutor, and third, the acceptance or rejection of the proposed candidate by the speaker.

Collaborative word search sequences interrupt the business-at-hand in order to deal with a 'problem of speaking'. As such, they constitute a specific type of repair sequence, namely self-initiated other-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977). Such repair sequences may be considered *parenthetical sequences*, interrupting and suspending the main communicative activity in course (Mazeland 2007). The preference for progressivity implies that the interactants will display an orientation to minimizing the interruption and resuming the main activity (Stivers & Robinson 2006). And this is surely the case in most word search sequences. Once the word is found, the speaker immediately resumes the main activity. However, in the cases under investigation here, the speakers do not display such an orientation, but instead expand the parenthetical sequence beyond the identification of the missing word. The expansions consist of (sequences of) repeats of the word proposed. The analysis argues that these expansions display an orientation to the lexical item as a learnable and to pursuing the pedagogical activity of teaching and learning the word as a relevant activity in and of itself. As such, the participants orient to different concerns than just repairing the problem of speaking.

Word search sequences in L2 interaction

Word search sequences have been a popular topic in research on L1/L2 interaction, as this is one of the prime situations in which second language speakers display their incomplete competence in the target language. Some researchers have noted that word search sequences in L1/L2 interaction may constitute a beneficial environment for language learning. For instance, Brouwer (2003) shows that sometimes L2 speakers display an orientation to the L1 speakers as language experts, for instance by inquiring about the correctness of a word used. She also shows that L1 speakers may provide assistance in finding the correct word, and that the L2 speakers may learn from repeating the word and incorporating it into their utterance-in-progress.

Several studies have described in more detail the forms such word search sequences may take. Brouwer (2004) describes a practice whereby an L2 speaker in the course of producing an utterance displays trouble in producing the next item and then produces a candidate lexical item with rising intonation. This is treated by the interlocutor as a request for confirmation and responded to by confirmation or correction. The search is thus oriented to linguistic form in that the L2 speaker may be considered as 'doing pronunciation'. A similar practice, called a 'vocabulary check', is

described by Hosoda (2006), who shows that the interlocutors, in treating such a lexical item produced with rising intonation as a request for approval, orient to their respective statuses as language 'novices' and 'experts'.

Kurhila (2006) describes another form of search sequence explicitly related to linguistic form, namely the search for a correct morphological inflection. Again, L2 speakers are seen to orient to the L1 interlocutor as a language authority by producing inflectional suffixes with rising intonation and gazing at them.

Koshik & Seo (2012) observe that searches by L2 speakers may concern a range of language related phenomena, such as finding the appropriate word, the correct word form, the syntactic structure or pronunciation. They relate the practice of producing an element with rising intonation (and gaze at the interlocutor) to the practice of *try-marking*, otherwise used for checking the recognizability of a person-referring expression (Sacks & Schegloff 1979). They also show that a simple acknowledgement token (such as 'uh-huh') as a response is multiply ambiguous. It may constitute a confirmation of the accuracy of the linguistic unit produced or the content of the turn, or it may claim understanding of what was said. L2 speakers are thus observed to initiate repair to check the correctness of their contribution.

Finally, Kim (2012) describes a practice that does not take the form of a word search sequence, but involves a similar 'acquisitionally rich environment'. This occurs when an L2 speaker gives a description of a phenomenon, often using a lengthy explanation, and the L1 speaker then provides a more specialized lexical item capturing it. The L2 speaker thus manages to achieve recognitional reference, but is provided with a more specialized and economical means of referring to the phenomenon.

The research on word searches in L2 conversation has thus mainly focused on the L2 speakers' *initiation* of the search activity rather than on its completion. Some studies describe the strategies used to provide cues to the interlocutor to prompt candidate solutions, and others describe the presentation of candidate solutions by the speakers themselves and how they are responded to. There has been less focus on how L2 speakers display receipt of candidate solutions and use these as models for learning a new word or construction. This is what the current study proposes to investigate.

Full or partial repetition is commonly used in the third position as a receipt of information. Such repeats may be produced with falling intonation, possibly also followed by a positive or negative response word (yeah/no), displaying identification of the form of the contribution or claiming understanding of it (Svennevig 2004). Alternatively, they may be produced with rising intonation, making relevant a response by the interlocutor (Jefferson 1972). In the latter case, they constitute repair initiations,

and as such could potentially be addressing a range of trouble sources, such as requesting confirmation of hearing or displaying problems of understanding (Schegloff 1997, Robinson 2013). The current study focuses on how repetition is used by L2 speakers to display their identification of the word proposed and their ability to pronounce it.

Data

The data for this study consists of video recordings of interaction between a Polish construction worker, Tomasz, and his various foremen on two different construction sites in Norway. Tomasz had been working in Norway for approximately 4 years on a project basis, commuting between the countries on a weekly shift system. He reported that during this time he had some lessons with a private instructor in the beginning and he had also started attending a Norwegian course but had given up after some time. Consequently, the main source of his language learning had been interacting with Scandinavian colleagues at the workplace

The recordings document Tomasz in his daily work in selected periods of time within a span of 18 months, while he was working on two different construction sites. The construction sites are restricted areas for safety reasons, so we made the recordings by means of an action camera mounted on Tomasz' hardhat. With a remote control, Tomasz turned on the camera when he interacted with his co-workers. We asked him to record his conversations with his Scandinavian colleagues, and these were mainly foremen and shift leaders. Some recordings of meetings in the foremen's office were also made by the researchers.¹ The total recording time of the video data is 6,12 hours (Site 1: 2,17 hours, site 2: 3,55 hours). In addition, we conducted ethnographic interviews with both Tomasz and his foremen.

Some information about the multilingual situation on these construction sites is in place. Tomasz' working language with his foremen is Norwegian. In the interviews, Tomasz informed us that he does not speak English, but that he speaks some German, having worked in Germany for some years in the past. He is the team leader of a group of Polish concrete workers, and with them he speaks his native language, Polish. As the other people in the team do not speak Norwegian, Tomasz is the intermediary between

¹ The research team consisted of Kamilla Kraft and myself. For more details on the data collection, see Kraft (2017).

the management and the workers, relaying information and instructions to them about the tasks to be performed.

The foremen in both construction sites are Norwegian and Swedes, and in fact all the foremen in the examples below are Swedes. Swedish and Norwegian are closely related languages and are intercomprehensible by most native speakers, so interaction between Swedes and Norwegians is usually conducted by each party using their native language. However, as is the case with most Scandinavian work migrants, the Swedish foremen have incorporated some Norwegian words into their vocabulary and speak a mixture of the two languages (Braunmüller 2002).

When we asked Tomasz whether it was difficult for him to understand Swedish he answered that he did not hear the difference. And since there are so many Swedish construction workers in Norway, Tomasz has probably been exposed to a lot of both Swedish and Norwegian in the workplaces he has been to. Actually, in many of the cases investigated below, the words he asks about are presented in Swedish and not in Norwegian, such as 'hängränna' (gutter), which in Norwegian is 'takrenne', or 'eksponderbult' (expansion bolt), which is 'ekspansjonsbolt' in Norwegian. However, this difference is not topicalized in the interaction itself, so *for the participants* the words are oriented to as 'Norwegian' for all practical purposes.

Analysis

This section will present analyses of four excerpts. The first example is a minimal (unexpanded) word search sequence, displaying an orientation to minimizing the interruption and continuing the main activity in progress, whereas the next three show expanded sequences with increasingly extended repeat sequences.

The first excerpt is from the office of the foreman, Dag. He has previously asked Tomasz to check the price of roof tiles in Poland, as he is building a new house. In the excerpt, Tomasz is listing the items that are included in the offer he has obtained from a manufacturer in Poland. Present is also Nils, his shift leader.

(1) GUTTER (KKJS-bøka-20140625-e29-IMa)

- 1 TOM: e::h o::g (1.9) på khele tak,
e::h a::nd (1.9) on whole roof,
2 (1.1) ((TOM points to picture on brochure))
3 TOM: ru:r, OG OG hva heter det på norsk. ((points out the window))
pipes, AND AND what's it called in Norwegian.
4 NIL: >ja häng[ränna.<|
yeah gutters.
5 DAG: | ja | ränn- [jaja
yeah gutt- yeah yeah
6 TOM: |ja
yeah
7 TOM: og den,
and that,
8 DAG: ja,
yeah,
9 (0.6)
10 TOM: o:g tretti år garan (.) [ti:re,
a:nd thirty years warran (.) ty
11 DAG: |ja,
yeah,



The items included in the offer (pipes, gutters and thirty years warranty) are presented in a list format, with rising intonation on each of the constituent parts (Selting 2007). The increased volume on the conjunction 'og' ('and') in line 3 gives the impression of something suddenly remembered. The conjunction is recycled, as a first display of trouble, and immediately Tomasz proceeds to enquire about the name in Norwegian. Simultaneously, he starts moving towards the window and pointing to the gutter on the roof outside (see picture), thus providing a gestural cue as to which word he is searching for.

Both Nils and Dag join in, Nils somewhat quicker than Dag. They both provide a candidate suggestion, but Dag aborts his suggestion midcourse (line 5), probably having heard that Nils has already produced the candidate. They also both preface their suggestion with a confirmation token, displaying recognition of the referent intended by Tomasz' pointing gesture. Thus, they seem more oriented towards displaying that they have identified the referent than establishing the correct term for it. Also Tomasz displays the same orientation in that he immediately provides just a minimal receipt token (line 6) and no repeat of the suggested candidate. Instead he confirms the candidate solution by referring to it by a deictic term 'den' ('that') (line 7) as he resumes the main activity of listing items (lines 7-11). Actually, it is questionable whether he heard Nils's candidate suggestion at all, given that it was produced with high tempo and in partial overlap with Dag's confirmation token. In any case, the point is that the participants here show an orientation to minimizing the repair sequence and returning to the main business of the talk once they have identified the intended referent, rather than establishing mutual identification and recognition of the word searched for.

The next excerpt shows an expanded sequence, involving repeats by both parties. Tomasz is out on the construction site and talks to a different foreman, Johan (JOH). His errand is to get the foreman to order more expansion bolts, but he runs into trouble finding the Norwegian word for this. His first solitary word search in line 1 results in a try-marked candidate solution, 'dibel'. This is probably an attempted norwegianized version of the German word for expansion bolt, "dübel", as Tomasz frequently resorts to German words when he does not know a word in Norwegian. Only when this does not result in mutual understanding, he appeals to Johan for assistance in finding the word in Norwegian (line 12).

(2) EXPANSION BOLT (KKJS-hali-20140205-e13-01-IMa 10:00)

1 TOM: kanskje (0.8) du kan bestille: (0.6) mh: (1.1) dibel?
maybe (0.8) you can order: (0.6) mh: (1.1) dibel?
2 (1.4)
3 JOH: °dibel?°
4 TOM: di- dibel.
5 JOH: dibel?
6 TOM: FAEN. ((drops bolt on the ground))
SHIT.
7 (0.3)
8 JOH: ()
9 (0.5)
10 TOM: °shit° ((bends down and picks it up))
11 (3.3)
12 TOM: den, **hva heter det** (.) **på norsk.**
*that, **what's it called** (.) **in norwegian.***
13 JOH: =e:h ekspanderbult.
=e:h expansion bolt.
14 TOM: <ekspanderbult?>
<expansion bolt?>
15 JOH: ja, ekspanderbult. ((nikker))
yeah, expansion bolt. ((nods))
16 TOM: kanskje vi (0.5) ekstra security? ((bends down))
maybe we (0.5) extra security?
17 (1.4)
18 JOH: (tror du det?) ((nods))
(you think?)
19 (1.5)
20 JOH: et pa- et paket?
one pa- one package?
21 TOM: et pakk. (0.4) et pakke.
one pack. (0.4) one package.

When Johan treats the word 'dibel' as problematic by initiating repair, Tomasz tries a different solution, namely to show him a physical exemplar of the intended referent. After a side sequence in which he drops the bolt on the ground and picks it up again, he holds it up in front of Johan and refers to it with the deictic pronoun 'den' ('that') (line 12). As in the previous example, he uses the physical presence of the object as a

resource to achieve reference. Having done so, he then proceeds to ask what it is called in Norwegian. Johan provides the word asked for (line 13) and produces it with falling intonation, thus indexing high epistemic stance (K+) (Heritage 2012). At this point, successful reference is achieved, and the word originally searched for is retrieved. According to the preference for progressivity, the main sequence (proposing to purchase bolts) could and should now be resumed. However, in contrast to the previous example, Tomasz at this point produces a questioning repeat in a markedly slow and emphatic format, with focal stress on each of the constituent parts of the word. This seems thus oriented to checking the identification of the phonological form of the word, 'doing pronunciation' (Brouwer 2004). Johan's answer to this request for confirmation takes the form of a type-conforming response word ('ja'), but in addition he repeats the word once more (line 15). This expansion may also be considered an orientation to the linguistic form of the word rather than just answering the question in a minimal format. Only at this point, Tomasz resumes the main project and returns to the question of ordering expansion bolts in order to achieve some "extra security" (line 16).

This example thus shows that the two-fold repetition of the word expands the parenthetical repair sequence beyond the point where the repair solution is achieved. The emphatic form of the repeat in the confirmation check turns it into a display of Tomasz' identification of the linguistic form of the word and his ability to pronounce it. This can be considered 'doing learning' a new word (Sahlström 2011). And Johan's additional repeat in line 15 provides Tomasz with yet a new 'model' of the word, and can thus be considered 'doing teaching'.

We find an even more extended repeat sequence in the next excerpt. Tomasz and Johan are in a meeting with two representatives from the company providing construction materials and equipment, Alf and Allan. Prior to the excerpt, Johan and Tomasz have been listing the supplies they would like to order. In line 1, Tomasz initiates a new item by the conjunction 'og' ('and'). However, a silence occurs, and he gazes at Johan and appeals to him for help by asking what it is called in Norwegian. Simultaneously, he lifts his right hand and starts moving his index and middle fingers in a 'cutting' gesture, depicting a scissor (see picture). In order to understand the rest of this excerpt it is useful to know that a standing joke in such communities is to call bolt tongs for 'master key' since they can be used to open all sorts of locks. The participants in the pictures are from the left to the right: Alf, Allan, Johan and Tomasz.

Excerpt (2) BOLT TONGS (KKJS-hali-20140124-e4-04-EMa)

- 1 TOM: o:g (0.7) ((gazes at JOH)) [hva heter det] på norsk?
a:nd what's it called in Norwegian?
- 2 ALF: [fem og femti,]
fifty five
- 3 (1.8) ((TOM makes scissors with fingers))
- 4 TOM: °klippe°,
°cut°,
- 5 JOH: JA, e:m: he he he. en hovednøkkel.
YEAH, e:m: he he he. a master key.
6 (1.5)
- 7 ALF: en hovednøkkel ja. ↓ja m- ↑ja.
a master key right. ↓yeah m- ↑yeah.
((starts writing))
- 8 JOH: he he hva er det för nåt?=
((points to ALF))
he he what is it?=
9 ALF: =en boltesaks.=
=bolt tongs.=
- 10 JOH: =boltesaks. he [he] ((points to TOM))
=bolt tongs. he he
- 11 TOM: [bo-] bol te saks? ((JOH clips with hands))
[bo-] bolt tongs?
- 12 ALF: [ja.
yeah.
- 13 JOH: [boltesaks ja.
bolt tongs yeah.
14 (1.1) ((TOM nods))
- 15 JOH: °boltesaks°
°bolt tongs°
16 (0.9)



Tomasz makes the cutting gesture for a period of 1.8 seconds, and Johan attends to the gesture but does not come up with a candidate suggestion. At that point, Tomasz adds a verbal cue, 'klippe' ('cut') (line 4) and Johan produces a claim of recognition by the emphatic confirmation token 'ja' ('yeah'). He finally provides a candidate suggestion, 'master key', but prefaces it by laughter tokens, thus marking it as non-serious. Johan produces the candidate with falling intonation (again indexing high epistemic stance). Furthermore, he addresses Alf by means of gaze and thus turns the utterance into a request for supplies. This way he orients to carrying out the main business of the talk (ordering supplies) rather than providing Tomasz with the word searched for.

After a rather long pause, probably due to extra processing effort needed to interpret the metaphorical reference term, Alf produces an accepting response, without any orientation to the humorous character of Johan's turn (line 7). The response consists of a repeat plus a confirmation token with falling intonation, a receipt format conventionally used to signal understanding of the previous action (Svennevig 2004). The subsequent confirmation tokens then display acceptance and granting of the order. Simultaneously, he starts writing, thus displaying that the order is being registered.

At this point, the sequence is potentially complete, and the activity of listing new items to be ordered could have proceeded. However, Johan expands the sequence by asking Alf what it is called, while continuing to laugh and thus evoking a humorous mode (line 8). Given that successful reference had already been achieved, this new word search sequence can be seen as oriented to establishing the correct lexical item as a relevant activity in itself. Alf immediately responds with the technical term ‘boltesaks’ (‘bolt tongs’), and Johan repeats this as he turns to Tomasz and points to him. This repeat is thus not just a receipt of information (as was Alf’s repeat in line 7), but a repeat performed *for* Tomasz, thus providing him with the information that he had requested at the outset (in line 1). Subsequently, he starts performing an iconic gesture in which he makes a large ‘clipping’ movement with his hands, as if operating a pair of bolt tongs (see picture). These actions thus make salient both the linguistic form and the meaning for Tomasz, and thus the expansion seems oriented to the activity of ‘teaching a new word’.

Just like in the previous example, Tomasz also seems to orient to the word as a lexical item to be learned in that he repeats it in a slow and emphatic manner, pronouncing each syllable with focal stress. And Johan continues to orient to the activity of teaching by repeating the word twice more, once as a confirmation repeat (line 13) and then once more with low volume after a long pause, as a recompletion and closing of the sequence.²

The final example includes not just repetition as a way of displaying identification and pronunciation of a word, but in addition includes a long sequence of ‘rehearsing’ the new lexical item. Tomasz is on the construction site and talks to his foreman Johan about securing a sector of the site with a fence.

(4) FENCE (KKJS-hali-20140129-e10-IMa)

1 TOM: har du (0.5) etterpå s:ecurity?
do you have (0.5) afterwards s:ecurity?

² In this example, a complicating factor consists in the fact that Johan himself initiates a second word search sequence by asking Alf for the name. One could thus wonder whether Johan’s first repeat is related to his own search activity, as a receipt of the correct word having been provided. And it may do double duty in this respect, but as shown in the analysis, the repeat is clearly addressed to Tomasz by his use of gesture and posture. Furthermore, Johan’s Swedish language background could be relevant here, since he merely relays a word in a second language (the Swedish equivalent being similar, but not identical – ‘bultsax’). However, there are no signs of him reducing his epistemic authority in presenting it to Tomasz. The final repeat in *sotto voce* (line 15) is ambiguous. I have interpreted it as yet another presentation of a model *for* Tomasz, but it could also look like a ‘memorizing’ repeat, as if he was practicing a new word.

2 (0.3)
3 TOM: hva hetter det på norsk.
what's it called in norwegian.
4 (0.7)
5 TOM: eh: den. ((points at fence))
eh: that.
6 (1.2)
7 TOM: gjerde? (/jæ:re/)
fence?
8 JOH: =gjerde. (/je:re/)
=fence.
9 JOH: [gje-] gjerde gjerde. (/je:re je:re/)
fen- fence fence.
10 TOM: [gje-]
11 TOM: gjerde? (/je:re/)
fence?
12 JOH: ja.
yeah.
13 TOM: gjerde. (/je:re/)
fence.
14 JOH: =ja.
=yeah.
15 (1.8)
16 TOM: (COUGH)
17 JOH: <gje:rde.> (/je:de/)
<*fence.*>
18 (0.2)
19 TOM: ja
yeah
20 (0.7)
21 JOH: °med d i det.° ↑ja.
°*with a d in it.*° ↑*yeah.*

In asking the question in line 1, Tomasz uses the English word ‘security’, possibly displaying a lack of vocabulary in Norwegian. Rather quickly he initiates a transition space repair by asking what it is called in Norwegian. The question is further specified by the addition (in a new transition space repair) of a verbal and gestural cue, the deictic pronoun ‘that’ and pointing toward a fence nearby (line 5). However, the cues do not seem to help Johan identify the intended referent. After a pause of 1.2 seconds he produces a candidate solution himself, with rising intonation, thus indicating low epistemic stance (K-). Johan confirms the suggestion by repeating the word, although slightly modifying the pronunciation from /jæ:re/ to /je:re/ as an embedded correction (Jefferson 1987, Kurhila 2006).³ He immediately expands his answer by repeating the word twice (line 9), thus orienting to the linguistic form of the word. Tomasz also orients to the form of the word by repeating it once more in a confirmation check (line 11). The subsequent repeat in line 13 may not be considered a new confirmation check, as it is produced with falling intonation. Thus, it seems rather to constitute a ‘rehearsing’

³ Tomasz’ pronunciation in line 7 is correct according to the norm of the Oslo variety, so Johan’s correction here actually imposes a deviant pronunciation of the word.

of the word. Johan confirms once more and thereby contributes to closing the sequence.

After a long pause of 1.8 seconds, however, he reopens the sequence by producing yet another token of the word (line 17), this time modifying the pronunciation to a retroflex 'd' (/je:de/). He also adds a metalinguistic explanation 'with a d in it', accounting for the change in pronunciation. The word is written 'gjerde' in standard Norwegian, and the letter combination 'rd' is usually pronounced as a retroflex 'd' in Eastern Norwegian. However, in this word, the letter 'd' is 'silent', and only the phoneme /r/ is realized. The word is thus presented as a representation of the written form of the word, rather than a self-correction of the original pronunciation. Consequently, this expansion seems to be concerned with informing Tomasz about the spelling of the word, and thus constitutes yet another act of 'teaching vocabulary' – this time related to written rather than spoken language.

Especially interesting in this example is how the Swede Johan takes the role of Norwegian language expert. The word 'gjerde' ('fence') is not in common use in Swedish, where the corresponding word has a very different form – 'staket'. In spite of this, Johan nowhere reduces his epistemic stance, nor does he account for his source of knowledge by markers of *evidentiality* (Chafe 1986). He thus does not display his status as a L2 speaker himself and instead positions himself as an authority concerning Norwegian pronunciation and spelling.

Orienting to lexical items as learnables

The analysis shows how a migrant worker, Tomasz, while carrying out everyday workplace activities, may use emergent problems of finding words as an opportunity to engage in language learning. When faced with a lack of relevant vocabulary, he mainly uses embodied actions to establish the referent of the word being searched for. When it is a designation of a physical object in the perceptual field of the interlocutors, he uses indexical gestures (pointing) and object manipulation (holding up an object) in combination with deictic verbal expressions (especially the pronoun 'that'). When the object is not visually accessible (as in example (4) with the bolt tongs), he uses iconic gestures to illustrate the object in question (Kendon 2004). Finally, he also uses verbal cues to hint at the intended referent, as when he says 'cut' (ex. 4).

The last three examples furthermore show that Tomasz is not just oriented to establishing reference and pursuing the workplace activity. Instead, he expands the word search sequences in order to check the words proposed and to rehearse the pronunciation of them. The orientation to the words as learnables is observable in all three positions of the word search sequence.

In first position of the word search sequence, Tomasz formulates the question as an inquiry about the form of the word *in Norwegian*, thus presenting it as a language

problem rather than a memory problem. It is also unequivocally addressed to his interlocutors by gaze direction and not to himself, as is often the case when the word search consists in retrieving an already known word (Goodwin & Goodwin 1986).

In second position, we see that the L1 speaker, Johan, presents the candidate suggestions with falling intonation (examples 2 and 3), thus claiming epistemic authority concerning the matter at hand. When Tomasz presents a candidate suggestion himself (example 4) it is produced with rising intonation, thus appealing to Johan for acceptance. This contrasts with the usual pattern in word search sequences dealing with *retrieval*, where instead the interlocutor usually suggests candidates with rising intonation and the speaker displays acceptance by producing the word with falling intonation (Koshik & Seo 2012). Both parties may thus be considered as orienting to Johan as the person with epistemic authority in the matter, thus being constituted as the 'language expert', whereas Tomasz is constituted as the 'language learner'.

In the third position, we see that Tomasz orients to the form of the word by repeating it with rising intonation. This repeat may be considered as checking two things simultaneously. First, it is a display of 'hearing', that is, that he has identified correctly the phonological form of the word uttered. Second, it constitutes a check whether or not he is able to reproduce the word with correct pronunciation. The focus on form is especially clear in the cases where the repeat is produced with an 'upgraded' phonetic pattern (Curl 2005), that is, with low pace and emphatic stress (ex. 2 and 3). The rising intonation marks the word as tentative and contingent on acceptance by the interlocutor, who is thereby cast in the expert role. This practice may thus be considered a part of the activity of learning language, checking the form of a new vocabulary item (Hosoda 2006) and 'doing pronunciation' (Brouwer 2004).

Questioning repeats that are used to check hearing are generally confirmed by a simple confirmation token. However, in the data examined here, we see that the L1 speaker does not respond with a minimal acknowledgment but by repeating the word once more (ex. 2 and 3). This further expansion of the sequence may thus also be considered as oriented to the linguistic form of the lexical item. In example 4 we have furthermore seen that the third position may be expanded even more by additional repeats. Tomasz repeats the word as a 'rehearsal' of it, and Johan repeats it to provide further metalinguistic information about it (spelling).

In this context of collaborative word search sequences, we may thus observe that third position repeats are treated as oriented to linguistic form. This contrasts with what Lilja (2014) found concerning partial repeats in L2 interaction in other sequential environments. She notes that when L2 speakers repeat parts of the L1 speakers' utterances, this is treated as an indication of language-based trouble in understanding, and consequently responded to by explanations of meaning. In the current case, the

repeats are treated as indicating potential problems with the *form* of the word, and thus responded to by confirmations or additional repetitions. Both these patterns of repair may be explained by the principle described by Robinson (2013), namely that identification of the trouble source ('diagnosis') is contingent upon epistemic status, that is, the speaker's assumptions about the repair-initiator's knowledge of the repeated item. When an L2 speaker initiates repair by repeating a potentially difficult vocabulary item, the L1 speaker has grounds to assume that the problem may be a lack of understanding. However, in a word search sequence initiated by the L2 speaker, the meaning of the word searched for is already established by other means, and thus the most plausible trouble source becomes the identification of the linguistic form of a word heard for the first time.

In addition to specifying the pedagogical aspects of post-expansion repeats in word search sequences, the analysis contributes to a better understanding of the workplace as an arena for language learning in the wild. In the current case, a resource for learning is constituted by the fact that the talk mainly concerns objects in the physical surroundings. These objects may thus be referred to ostensively and used as basis for acquiring new technical vocabulary relevant to carrying out the workplace task at hand. The concrete physical nature of this workplace (and potentially other so-called 'blue-collar' workplaces) thus offers specific resources for language learning.

As noted, other studies have found that much lingua franca workplace interaction is characterized by slight attention to language in that participants do not 'flag' problems and let mistakes pass without correction (Firth 1996, Wagner & Firth 1997). This is different in the current data. Both the L2 employee and the L1 manager invest additional effort into teaching and learning new words, and may thus be considered as orienting to the long-term goal of turning the employee into a proficient speaker of Norwegian rather than just to the short-term goal of completing the workplace task they are engaged in. The difference may be related to the fact that the L2 speaker in this case is a low-proficient speaker with a proclaimed desire to learn Norwegian. In any case, the current study shows that at least in some workplaces, language learning is attended to as a relevant activity in and of itself alongside the accomplishment of everyday work tasks.

The study thus contributes to a better understanding of the processes of language learning *in the wild* by showing the interactional practices available for teaching and learning new words in the course of everyday workplace interaction. It also shows that such processes involve emergent changes in footing, realized by the L2 speaker positioning him- or herself as a language learner and thereby inviting the interlocutor to take the role of language expert and teacher. As the pedagogical activity of teaching and learning a new word requires extra effort from both parties, language

learning in the wild becomes a truly collaborative achievement. As such, it also temporarily redefines the roles and relationships between the participants. In this case, the asymmetry implied by the manager/employee relation is to a certain degree inversed: In the pedagogical side sequence, it is no longer the employee doing work to serve the professional interests of the manager, but the manager putting in interactional effort in the service of the employee's interests. Thus, the practices of language learning in the wild are not just consequential for the processes of language acquisition, but also impact the real-world activities and relationships they are embedded in.

References

- Braunmüller, K. (2002). Semicommunication and accommodation: observations from the linguistic situation in Scandinavia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12, 1-23.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534-545.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2004). Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversation* (pp. 96-113). London: Continuum.
- Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (pp. 261-272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Curl, T.S. (2005). Practices in Other-Initiated Repair Resolution: The Phonetic Differentiation of 'Repetitions'. *Discourse Processes*, 39, 1-43.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On «lingua franca» English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.
- Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 85-100.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gestures and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62, 51-75.
- Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57, 100—117.
- Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and*

- Social Interaction*, 36, 109–141.
- Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45, 1-29.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294-338). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kraft, K. (2017). *Constructing Migrant Workers: Multilingualism and Communication in the Transnational Construction Site*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Oslo.
- Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Y. (2012). Practices for initial recognitional reference and learning opportunities in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 709–729.
- Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second language interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the “semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilja, N. (2014) Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98-116.
- Majlesi, A.R. & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1, 193-207.
- Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1816–69.
- McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Park, I. (2007). Co-construction of word search activities in native and non-native speaker interaction. Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol. 7, No. 2. Teachers College, Columbia University.
<http://tesolal.columbia.edu/article/co-construction-of-word-search/> (accessed 27 July 2015).
- Robinson, J. D. (2013). Epistemics, action formation, and other-initiation of repair: the case of partial questioning repeats. In Hayashi, M., Raymond, G. & Sidnell, J. (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding* (pp. 261-292). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.
- Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as social action. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 45-65). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23, 499-547.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Selting, M. (2007). Lists as embedded structures and the prosody of list construction as an interactional resource. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 483-526.
- Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds.) (2013). *The handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35, 367-392.
- Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies*, 6, 489–516.
- 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. 93-116). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S.W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75-101). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wagner, J. & Firth, A. (1997). Communication strategies at work. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 323–344). London: Longman.