Also meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben: Use of the German particle “also” in a study abroad context

Also meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben: Die Verwendung der deutschen Partikel “also” im Kontext des Auslandstudiums

by

Ronald Schirm

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
and the Universitaet Mannheim
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Intercultural German Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada / Mannheim, Germany, 2015

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners. I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

English Abstract

Conversation is at the core of human interaction, and has long been studied. Upon analysis, conversation proves to be highly regular and organized, and governed by an array of unconscious practices (see Sidnell, 2010; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The field of Conversation Analysis (CA), by using recordings of everyday human interactions, seeks to uncover this set of practices; CA however, has been primarily focused on L1 speakers' interactions, and the CA research for second language acquisition (SLA) has been mostly focused on foreign language classroom interactions (see Pekarek Doehler, 2013; Seedhouse, 2004). The current study investigates the interactions between L2 and L1 speakers of German, using CA, in order to expand research into study abroad contexts. Using recordings of four Canadian advanced learners of German studying abroad in Germany interacting with two German L1 speakers, I focus on their particle use in German. It is often argued that particles, among other pragmatic features, are too nuanced for foreign language learners to acquire to use them in a target-like manner purely through interacting in the L2. Therefore, researchers argue that they should be taught explicitly in the foreign language classroom (see Betz & Huth, 2014). I demonstrate, through an analysis of L2 speakers' use of the German discourse particle *also*, that language learners use particles in interaction and, more importantly, that the learners' particle use can be target-like. The current study also demonstrates that CA can be used to understand foreign language learners' interactions in the same way that it is used to analyse L1 speakers' interactions. Furthermore, CA can be applied to track how the ways in which learners interact in the L2 changes during study abroad, providing deeper insights into the effects of studying abroad.

Deutsches Abstract

Konversation steht im Zentrum menschlicher Interaktion. Die systematische Analyse dieser Interaktionen zeigt, dass konversationelle Interaktion in hohem Maße regelmäßig und organisiert ist, und dass sie durch eine Reihe interaktionaler Muster geregelt ist, derer die Sprecher sich größtenteils nicht bewusst sind (Sidnell, 2010; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Die Analyse von Aufnahmen alltäglicher Interaktionen mit konversationsanalytischen (CA) Mitteln hat als Ziel die Dokumentation dieser Muster, jedoch ist der Fokus dieser Forschung typischerweise die Interaktion zwischen muttersprachlichen Interaktionsteilnehmern (L1-Sprechern). Die Analyse von spontanen Interaktionen zwischen/von Sprachlernern (L2-Sprechern) ist bisher auf Klassenzimmerinteraktionen begrenzt (Pekarek Doehler, 2013). In dieser Arbeit verwende ich CA, um die Sprachverwendung von L2-Sprecher im deutschen Auslandsstudium zu analysieren. Ich analysiere Aufnahmen von Interaktionen zwischen vier kanadischen Deutschlernern und zwei Muttersprachlern. Dabei konzentriere ich mich auf die Verwendung deutscher Partikeln durch die L2-Sprecher. Partikeln haben primär pragmatische anstatt semantische Funktionen in der Interaktion, und alleiniger Kontakte mit der Zielsprache wird oft als unzureichend für das Erlernen dieser sprachlichen Elemente erachtet, und diese Elemente müssen deshalb in Sprachkursen explizit gelehrt werden (Betz & Huth, 2014). Ich zeige durch die Analyse der Sprachverwendung von L2-Sprechern, und im Besonderen der Verwendung der deutschen Diskurspartikel *also*, dass Fremdsprachlernende Partikeln in der Interaktion systematisch verwenden und dass die Verwendung der Partikeln *also* sich in bestimmten Kontexten mit der Verwendung der L1-Sprecher deckt. In bestimmten

interaktionalen Kontexten zeigen sich aber auch deutliche Unterschiede. Diese Studie zeigt an, dass CA verwendet werden kann, um L2-Interaktionen zu analysieren. Im *Study-Abroad*-Kontext kann CA verwendet werden, um systematische Veränderungen in den Interaktionsmustern Fremdsprachlernender während eines Auslandsstudiums sichtbar zu machen. Eine Integration von CA-Methodik in die *Study-Abroad*-Forschung kann zum besseren Verständnis der Erfahrungen Studierender im Auslandstudium beitragen.

Acknowledgements

While I am the sole author of this work, this work would not have been possible without the support I received throughout my studies, both at home in Waterloo and in Mannheim. I would first like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Emma Betz, for her expertise in Conversation Analysis, the patience with which she instructed me in the field, and the passion for research which she instilled in me. Secondly I would like to thank all the participants who took part in my study, allowing me to transcribe, dissect, and analyze their talk; without them this project would have truly been impossible. Thirdly I would like to thank all of the faculty and staff responsible who made my studies possible: Janet Vaughan and Sandra Schmidt for making sure I stayed on track and completed everything required to graduate; and Dr. Michael Boehringer and Dr. Regine Zeller for making this transatlantic Master's program a possibility.

Finally I would like to thank my family, my brother Max, his wife Jenna, my sister Geneviève, her husband Marc, all of my nieces and nephews, Olivier, Gabrielle, Étienne, and Alexandre, and my Oma, Rita, for their love and support both during my studies at home in Waterloo and abroad in Germany, as well as their (sometimes much needed) distractions. I especially want to thank my parents, Johanne and Ron, who have been with me in every step of my education, always encouraging me to do better, but always ready to catch me when I fall. Without any of you this work would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

List of Examples

List of Tables

1 Introduction

Conversation analysis, the study of human interaction, has already provided insights into how L1 speakers of a variety of languages interact (e.g., openings: Schegloff, 1968; repair: Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Kitzinger, 2013; Betz, 2008; Schegloff, 1979; linguistic particles: Golato, 2012; Betz & Golato, 2008; Golato & Betz, 2008; Golato, 2010; Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). While language learner interactions in the target language have been studied inside the classroom (e.g. Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013; Seedhouse, 1997), interactions in the study abroad context have not received much attention to date (except Brown 2013; Behrent 2007). This is not to say that classroom interactions are not useful in understanding L2 speakers' language use; the language learning classroom is a "dynamic, complex, fluid, and variable interactional environment" (Seedhouse, 1997, p. 348), "with its own peculiar organisation, why may be characterised and described" (p. 347). However, although classroom interactions contain sequences not directly related to "the official business of the lesson" (Seedhouse, 1997, p. 348), when studying classroom interaction, researchers must consider "the specific goals of the occasion that brings the interactants together in a classroom in the first place: teaching and learning" (Huth, 2011, p. 297). While teaching sequences do arise in everyday interaction, they are not typically the reason for the interaction, and therefore do not shape everyday interaction in the same was as classroom interactions (Huth, 2011). Everyday interactions are therefore the focus of the current study, rather than classroom interactions.

In the current project, I analyze the interactions of four Canadian L2 speakers [1]of German with German L1 speakers during study abroad in Germany. Focusing on their use of the German discourse marker *also*, chosen due to the prevalence of its production in the data, I analyze in detail how the individual L2 speakers' use of this particle compares to both L1 speakers' and their fellow L2 speakers' use.

I begin with a summary of previous study abroad research on language acquisition during study abroad, specifically on the acquisition of pragmatic features of the target language (Section 2.1); I then introduce linguistic particles, providing a definition and taxonomy of different kinds of linguistic particles in order to understand their potential functions interactionally (Section 2.2). In the Methodology and Data Section I outline the methodological approach and theoretical framework I use in this study, Conversation Analysis (Section 3.1); I then describe the participants and the nature of the data I analyze for the current project (Section 3.2). In the Analysis Section I present previous research on the particle I focus on in the current project, the German discourse particle *also*, before analyzing examples of both L2 and L1 speakers using this particle to perform a variety of actions. Throughout the Analysis section I compare the uses of *also* in my own data with the results of previous CA research on the particle. In the Discussion I position my project within the contexts of Conversation Analysis, Second Language Acquisition, and Study

[1] In this work I refer to the Canadian speakers of German as *L2 speakers* rather than as *language learners*. *Language learner* suggests that the ways in which L2 speakers' interactions in the L2 do not match that of their L1 counterparts are language deficiencies, and undermine the ways in these non-target-like interactions are communicatively successful (Firth & Wagner, 2007). I exapnd on this point further in my Discussion (section 5).

Abroad, presenting the current project's implications for both future research and pedagogy.

2 Literature Review

In this chapter, I present a selection of papers in study abroad research, each making use of different types of data and methodology to measure learners' language use and proficiency in relation to their study abroad experiences. I then shift focus to one feature of language, linguistic particles, describing what they are linguistically and what they do interactionally. This section is a general overview on the topic of particles, and includes only a selection of foundational CA research on the use and function of particles; I reserve research on specific particles for my discussion of L2 speakers' particle use in the analysis. Similarly, an overview of CA, that is, its conception of language and resulting methodologies, will follow in the Data & Methodology chapter of this work.

2.1 Study Abroad Research

In this section I discuss existing study abroad research, progressing from research that uses testing data to measure learners' foreign language acquisition during study abroad, to research considering learners' exposure to language forms during their study abroad, and lastly considering research analyzing the learners' interactions and experiences with the target culture. This selection shows a shift in study abroad research towards a more holistic approach to understanding learners' study abroad experience and L2 acquisition. However, it also illustrates a lack of data from naturalistic learner interactions in the L2, i.e. data of learners *using* the L2 in a natural setting; this kind of data is the most representative of language use (see Golato 2003), and it is the kind of data of which I make use in the current study. For example, in their study comparing the effects of instructional paradigm on German grammar acquisition during study abroad, Klapper & Rees (2003) use

standardized tests; Fernandez (2013) uses corpus data from the learners completing communicative tasks to study the ways in which they speak vaguely in Spanish as an effect of exposure to the target language during study abroad in a Spanish-speaking country. Finally, I present a study using naturalistic interactional data, namely Brown's 2013 study comparing learners' knowledge of Korean honorifics (as observed in their participation in Discourse Completion Tasks, or DCTs), their use of said honorifics in daily interactions during study abroad in Korea, and their reports of their experiences with the Korean honorifics system during study abroad.

Using a combination of grammar tests, C-tests, and examinations administered as part of foreign language classes, Klapper & Rees (2003) compared the L2 acquisition of 57 students of German in two different instructional conditions, namely one group with an explicit grammar instruction component (Focus on Forms, or FonFs) and one with primarily implicit grammar instruction through corrections on oral and written assignments (Focus on Form, or FonF). Of primary concern was the acquisition of the target language grammar, or, more specifically, the change in the learners' grammatical accuracy, before, during, and after time abroad in Germany or Austria as a function of instructional paradigm (Klapper & Rees, 2003). While, during the two-year instructional phase, the FonFs group showed statistically significantly greater improvement overall than did the FonF group, the results of the C-tests and grammar tests administered during the residency abroad showed that the FonF group had "made up a lot of the ground that it lost during the first two years of the programme" (p. 298), virtually closing this gap by the end of the sojourn (Klapper & Rees, 2003). This study provides insight into the acquisition of target language grammar, and the role of instruction in language acquisition. It uses and is

interested in *test* data as its primary data and does not draw on data from learners' target language use.

Fernandez (2013), by contrast, used corpus data to study learners of Spanish using the target language to complete a variety of communicative tasks in Spanish, such as interviews or narratives. Fernandez's (2013) focus was the frequency and use of general extenders (GEs), or "routinized chunks of language frequently utilized for shared pragmatic functions in interactions among language users with different levels of shared sociocultural experience" (p. 301) in the learners' L2 speech. GEs in Spanish typically involve the use of a conjunction in combination with: a "(vague) noun phrase (such as *cosas* 'things'), (2) a pronoun (such as *eso* 'that'), (3) or an adverb (phrase) (such as *tal* 'such')" (Fernandez, 2013, p. 301).

While, on the whole, the types of GEs the learners applied in the completion of the aforementioned communicative tasks approximated that of Spanish L1 speakers use of GEs in naturally occurring speech, a comparison of individual learners revealed stark differences in their GE use (Fernandez, 2013). A closer look into the responses to questions regarding their experiences abroad from four students revealed that increased and varied GE use, and especially target-like GE use, was positively correlated with increased interaction with Spanish L1s during the time abroad (Fernandez, 2013). For example, Ana, one of the participants in the study, was a nanny for a Spanish speaking family, and was highly motivated to improve her Spanish; she used GEs much more often than any other student in the corpus and her "preferred" GEs match "those GEs preferred by the expert speakers [in the corpus]... while performing the same tasks" (Fernandez, 2013, p. 320). Another participant, Isabel, who did not use any GEs in the tasks, lived with two Catalan

speakers during her time in Barcelona (Fernandez, 2013). These roommates would communicate with one another primarily in Catalan, and would only speak (Castilian) Spanish when speaking with Isabel (Fernandez, 2013). Since a large amount of corpus data can be analyzed for the use of certain linguistic features, and instances of the application of these linguistic features may otherwise be overlooked by human eyes, corpus data can serve as a useful tool in study abroad research, especially when coupled with data on individual experiences while abroad (Fernandez, 2013).

Fernandez's study, while taking into account learners' *exposure* to the target language during their time abroad, discusses neither the role of the target culture in language acquisition, nor the learners' experience with said culture; furthermore, while she used data of learners using communicative tasks, interactional data is the only way to understand how people interact in conversation[2]. Brown (2013) studied four male learners of Korean, their knowledge of Korean honorifics, their use of said honorifics in interactions with Korean L1 speakers during their study abroad, and their reported experiences with Korean honorifics during study abroad. In the Korean culture, the use of honorifics is determined by age, intimacy, and seniority in the given social (e.g. family) group or structured institutional (e.g. a company, university, etc.) context (Brown, 2013). In order to determine whether these Korean L2 speakers' use of honorifics mirrored that of Korean L1s, Brown (2013) compared the participants' results on discourse completion tasks with

[2] In her 2003 study, Golato compared the ways in which German L1 speakers respond to complements in interaction with how they report they would respond. She presented L1 German speakers with a set of complement response situations she observed in her interactional data. Upon comparison, Golato (2003) found that the kinds of complement responses L1 speakers report they would use do not match the complement responses used in interaction, demonstrating that analyzing interactional data is the only way to truly understand human interaction.

these learners' interactions in Korean and their experiences with honorifics in Korea (specifically, their interlocutors' expectations). In discourse completion tasks (also called discourse completion questionnaires; see Golato 2003), participants are presented with a variety of interactional situations in which they would be expected to negotiate the Korean honorifics system; participants are then asked to decide and record how they would act or react in this situation (Brown, 2013; Golato, 2003). DCTs, however, do not measure actual language use; rather, they measure how the participants *believe* they would act or react in the given situation (Golato, 2003; Brown, 2013). Brown (2013) therefore made use of data of the learners interacting with L1 speakers of Korean to analyze how they used Korean honorifics, and how the L2 speakers' honorifics use compared with that of their L1 counterparts.

While all four learners demonstrated a high level of explicit knowledge of the correct application of Korean honorifics, they used informal Korean (i.e. no honorifics) more than L1 speakers in their interactions, even in situations when L1 speakers would expect honorific use (Brown, 2013). While it may appear that the learners were unable to apply honorifics properly in interaction, interviews with the participants revealed that the native Koreans with which the participants had had contact not only expected informal speech from the learners, they even instructed the learners to use the informal, even in situations in which L1s would expect proper honorific use from other L1 speakers (Brown, 2013). This behaviour on the part of the native speakers of Korean suggests that, as foreigners studying abroad in Korea for a short period of time, the L2 speakers would not be able to enter the hierarchical system that is inherent in the Korean culture (Brown, 2013).

The four participants in Brown's study had different opinions on the expectations native Koreans displayed of the learners as foreigners within the Korean culture (Brown, 2013). One student from the United Kingdom found that informal speech allowed him to develop close relationships more quickly with native speakers of Korean than would formal speech (Brown, 2013). Another learner, a native speaker of German from Austria, expressed frustration at being addressed informally in situations in which formal speech is prescribed (Brown, 2013). A third, a Korean born in Germany, attempted to use informal speech as a form of humour when formal speech was expected, which native speakers of Korean often do; however, instead of being perceived as a competent speaker of Korean, this learner's deviation from the norm was interpreted as incompetence (Brown, 2013). Brown (2013) argues that the behaviour on the part of the native speakers of Korean hindered the learners' ability to develop a more nuanced/advanced competence with honorifics, no matter how knowledgeable the learners were of Korean honorifics and how motivated they were to "speak Korean like a Korean" (p. 295).

These three studies use a variety of data, but only Brown (2013) investigated learners' naturally occurring L2 use. Brown (2003), however, relies primarily on ethnographic data of the interactants as well as knowledge of the Korean honorifics system rather than recorded real-time interactional data itself to understand the participants' use of Korean honorifics in interaction[3]. As Golato (2003) demonstrated, only data from naturally occurring talk, that is, neither talk from communicative activities (such as

[3] CA relies primarily on interactional data itself, calling on ethnographic or cultural data when needed, rather than analysing the data through a cultural or ethnographic lens; I discuss this in more detail in Section 3.1.

interviews or role-plays), nor scores on a standardized test, nor survey responses can give as accurate of a picture of how interactants actually interact.

In the current study, I thus use video recordings of naturally occurring interaction between learners and native speakers of German in order to investigate the German L2 speakers' use of discourse particles. My focus, unlike that of the studies I presented, is not on language *acquisition* (that is, change over time) but rather language *use* at a specific point in the participants' stay abroad. My aim is to demonstrate that researchers can use CA methodology to document L2 language use in interaction; specifically, CA allows researchers to identify patterns in learners' interactions in the L2. Identifying such systematic patterns of use then allows researchers to track changes in learners' L2 use and hypothesize which of these patterns learners acquire during their time abroad vs. in the classroom, allowing us to better understand how learners acquire the target language during study abroad. The present study studies L2 use and not L2 acquisition. The study, however, aims to demonstrate how patterns of L2 use in interaction can be analyzed and documented, thus providing methodological insights that can be applied to longitudinal studies of acquisition. In the following section I discuss particles in more detail, namely what a (linguistic) particle is and what function it can have in interaction. I also outline, define, and differentiate the categories of particles I will refer to in this work.

2.2 Particles

Before we can begin to study linguistic particles and speakers' use of them, we must first understand what is and what is not a particle. Hentschel & Weydt (1989), in their work on German particles, aim not only to differentiate particles from other parts of speech, but also to classify particles based on their function. In German, for example, particles were

traditionally understood as any non-inflectable part of speech (or subset thereof). By this definition, adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions may all be considered "particles" in German (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). Because of differences in morphological complexity between languages, this definition does not apply equally to all languages: German, for example, is more morphologically complex than other languages, such as English or Chinese, and, as a result, some parts of speech are inflected in German but not in other languages (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). German attributive adjectives, for instance, must agree with the gender, number, and case of the noun, as well as the presence and type of preceding article; this agreement is shown through the addition of an adjective ending. In English, however, there is no agreement between adjective and noun, meaning attributive adjectives only have a single morphological form. According to the above definition, English adjectives *may* be considered particles, whereas German adjectives cannot be (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). Hentschel and Weydt (1989) use a narrower definition and treat particles as their own part of speech, as words with either a lexical meaning or meaning derived from their part of speech and their relationship with other parts of speech[4] (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989).

In this narrower definition of particles, Hentschel and Weydt (1989) differentiate between several kinds of particles: *Gradpartikeln* (which they further separate into *Intensivpartikeln* and *Fokuspartikeln*), *Modalwörter*, *Abtönungspartikeln*, and, finally, *Antwort-* and *Negationspartikeln*, all of which I will now briefly discuss.

[4] As opposed to nouns, adjectives, and verbs, which can all have meaning independent of their part of speech; consider the trio *blood* – *bloody* – *bleed*, all of which share meaning that transcends their individual parts of speech.

Intensivpartikeln take their name from the English "intensifier". As their name implies, they can serve an intensifying function, such as the German *sehr, höchst,* and *irre*; they can also serve to weaken or downgrade, as in the case of *ziemlich, etwas,* and *einigermaßen* (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). *Fokuspartikeln*, on the other hand, indicate the focus of the sentence; in the following example, the *nur* preceding the subject indicates this subject is the focus of the sentence:

Example 1 (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989, p. 11; invented)

Nur du kannst mir helfen.

In the case of *Fokuspartikeln,* it is important to note that directly preceding or even neighbouring the focus is not a requirement, i.e. the focussing function is independent of the particle's position relative to the focused element within the utterance; in the sentence *Ich habe den Film auch gesehen* (p. 12), *auch* marks the subject *Ich* as the focus, not its past participle neighbour *gesehen* (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989).

Fokuspartikeln are further divided into two subgroups: additives, such as *auch, gleichfalls,* and *sogar*, which indicate the focused item's membership to a group (e.g. the *auch* in *Ich habe den Film auch gesehen* indicates the subject's membership to a group of those who have seen the referred-to movie); and restrictives, such as *nur, einzig,* and *allein*, which indicate the uniqueness of the focus (e.g. in *Nur du kannst mir helfen*, the *du* is the only person that can help the speaker, as *Nur* indicates; Hentschel & Weydt, 1989).

Modalwörter indicate an utterance's level of possibility (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). *Modalwörter* such as *wahrscheinlich* and *sicherlich* indicate an utterance is more likely than those that contain *vielleicht* and *eventuell*; this differentiation between utterances that are "völlig sicher" (absolutely certain) and those that are "unmöglich" (impossible) is a central trait of these particles (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989, p. 13; my translation).

Abtönungspartikeln, such as *denn, doch,* and *mal*, derive their meaning purely from their relationship with the other lexemes in the utterance and from the larger context (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). Unlike *Gradpartikeln* and *Modalwörter*, both of which appear in written as well as in oral language use*, Abtönungspartikeln* are predominantly found in oral communication, especially face-to-face communication. They do not occur in first position in a sentence or utterance, stand before an utterance's rheme the part of the utterance containing information as to its theme, (except in cases where the particle would then be in first position), and can occur in combination with one another, such as *denn*, *doch* and *wohl* in the following example:

Example 2 (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989, p. 14, Invented)

Das ist denn doch wohl ein bisschen zu viel.

Finally, *Antwortpartikeln*, such as *ja, doch,* and *genau,* are responses to previous utterances. They may be either freestanding or in a larger utterance, but cannot be syntactically or prosodically integrated into following talk, i.e., they constitute their own turn constructional and prosodic unit (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989; Golato & Betz, 2008; Betz & Golato, 2008). Similar utterances, e.g. *mhm* or *hm*, also belong to the group of response particles (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989). *Negationspartikel*, such as *nicht* and *kein*, can be similarly responsive in nature; however, unlike *Antwortpartikel*, *Negationspartikel* can be (and are sometimes required to be, as in the case of *nicht* and *kein*) syntactically and prosodically integrated into the utterance in which they occur (Hentschel & Weydt, 1989).

There is much debate as to the difference between modal particles (MPs) and what are called discourse markers (DMs), and whether they can be clearly differentiated at all; while this issue may be in part because of the existence of modal particles in some languages but not others, the functions of these two kinds of pragmatic elements have also

been oberved as possibly overlapping (see Degand, Cornillie, and Pietrandrea, 2013). According to Diewald (2013), DMs appear to manage conversational structure; "they take care of the thematic structure, and they control the turn-taking system and other aspects of speech management" (Diewald, 2013, p. 26). Diewald (2013) goes further with her discussion of DMs, claiming they have a large variety of functions, allowing for the "establishing of sub-groups like response signals, segmentation signals, hesitation markers, etc." (p. 25). Diewald's (2013) definition of DMs would therefore include both response particles and discourse particles described above, and are a feature of all languages. MPs, on the other hand, appear only in certain language (e.g. German, Catalan, Swedish, Dutch, Danish, and Norwegian; see Degand, Cornillie, and Pietrandrea 2013), In German, the language of Diewald's (2013) focus, all MPs also have non-MP uses (e.g. *aber, schon, mal,* etc.. *halt* is the only exception to this rule; Diewald, 2013). Diewald (2013) concludes:

> MPs are a convenient and subtle way of introducing all kinds of implications, assumptions, allusions, without being explicit about that and this potential is the reason for the wealth of specific communicative and rhetoric functions for which MPs in German are renowned and which have lead to long listings of functions attributed to them (p. 33 ; see also Zifonun et al., 1997)

In slight contrast, Valdmets (2013), in her study on MPs and DMs in written Estonian, argues DMs indicate a relationship between the utterance in which it appears and surrounding utterances, while MPs create intimacy between interactants and (in line with Hentschel and Weydt's 1989 *Modalwörter* described above) "express the speaker's or writer's view on how true or certain the proposition expressed by the utterance is" (p. 110). While Diewald (2013) and Valdmets' (2013) conceptions of DMs and MPs are not mutually

exclusive, their differing focus in their conceptualizations of DMs and MPs does demonstrate the lack of consensus on what DMs and MPs are, what functions they are used to perform in interaction, and how to differentiate between them[5]. For this reason I make clear the categories of particles relevant to my study.

In the current project, and in line with much of the literature in interactional linguistics and CA, I differentiate between the following types of particles based on their function and position in an utterance: response particles (or response tokens)[6], discourse particles, and modal particles. With "response particles" I refer to particles that are inherently responsive. These include not only Hentschel & Weydt's (1989) *Antwortpartikeln* but also other particles that are responsive but do not indicate acknowledgement or (dis)agreement. *ach* and *achso*, for example, are responsive, but they primarily negotiate knowledge states rather than agreement (Golato & Betz, 2008). Furthermore, response particles typically occur directly after the utterance to which they are responding, i.e. typically in first position, coinciding with speaker change; while speakers *may* precede or follow a response particle utterance with further talk, even talk that the response particle made relevant, this talk is prosodically, syntactically, and pragmatically distinct from the response particle (Betz & Golato, 2008; Golato & Betz, 2008; Golato, 2012).

With "discourse particles" I will be referring to those particles that occur at turn beginnings, are never freestanding, and manage the connection between sequences and project further talk and features of the emerging turn (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). Each of

[5] See Degand, Cornillie, & Pietrandrea, 2013, for a more complete discussion of DMs and MPs and the difference between the two.

[6] I will be using "response particle" and "response token" interchangeably throughout this work.

these particles indicates a relationship with surrounding turns; a turn-initial *also*, for example, can project an inference based on what was uttered by the other interactant previously, while a *dann* in the same position indicates the utterance of a possible (forward-looking) consequence or upshot based on similar information (Deppermann & Helmer, 2013)[7].

Finally, with "modal particles", I will refer to Hentschel & Weydt (1989)'s *Abtönungspartikel*. These particles do not occur at turn beginnings, occur most often in oral communication (compared to other forms of communication), and derive their meaning from other lexemes within the same turn and from the larger interactional context. (Deppermann, 2009; Imo, 2008; Thurmair, 1989; Lütten, 1979; Diewald, 1999).

Although the three categories of particles I discuss above (i.e. response particles, discourse particles, and modal particles) are already differentiated from in each other in terms of function and placement, it is important to note the variety of particles that still exists within each category, and that each particle has its own specific function and use. Furthermore, particles that have a similar form or appear to have a similar function must be understood as different from one another; grouping "little words" such as *oh*, *yes*, *uh huh*, and *mm hm* together as "an undifferentiated collection of 'back channels' or 'signals of continued attention'" assumes they perform the same actions in the same way (Heritage, 1984, p. 336), and "such treatments seriously underestimate the diversity and complexity of the tasks that these [particles] are used to accomplish" (p. 337). When using CA to research particles and their functions in interaction, researchers must consider the particles function in relation to "(1) the conversational sequences in which [they] occur, (2)

[7] I will discuss *also* and *dann* (Deppermann & Helmer, 2013) in more detail below.

[their] precise placement within such sequences, and (3) the additional turn components that [they] commonly [preface]" (Heritage, 1984, p. 300; see also Schegloff, 1982; Sorjonen, 2001).

For example, in their 2013 article Deppermann and Helmer compared the discourse particles *also* and *dann* in German. Deppermann and Helmer (2013) argue that *also* projects an inference based off of knowledge the co-interactants share, i.e. in the co-interactants' *common ground* (p. 5). In the following example, taken from the first session between a patient (PA) and a therapist (TP), the patient is describing their troubles with their partner.

Example 3: Verhaltenstherapie Freiburg Ewald 13.36, angst um den partner (Deppermann & Helmer, 2013, p. 5)

```
01   PA:   er hat mittlerweile schon SO vie DURCHgemacht,
02         (.) un:; (--) wo er SELber sagt;
03         (-) s: (-) er is schOn an dem PUNKT,
04         (---) <<dim,all> dass er die medikaMENte Absetzt;>
05   TP:   (-) <<creaky,quietly> mhm.>
06   PA:   (-) .hh (-) und des beLASCHtet mich halt <<quietly> ↓AU noch,>
07   TP:   (-) <<creaky> mKAY;>
08         (1.5)
09   TP:   <<creaky, all, quietly> also> die angst um den PARTner?
10   PA:   (-) 'hmHM;
```

In line 01 the patient refers to the hardships the partner has undergone; in lines 02 to 04, the patient continues, referring to the partner saying they have reached a point at which they will stop taking their medication. In line 06 the patient concludes by stating something is causing them stress; in line 09, after a pause, the therapist makes an inference on the patient's utterance in line 06, providing a candidate unpacking of *des* based on the patient's reported experiences with the partner, namely that it is their fear for their partner causing them stress. The inference in line 09 is what the patient in line 06 intended to communicate,

as can be seen in line 10 in the patient's confirmation of the therapist's candidate unpacking in line 09 with *'hmHM;*. The *also* in line 09 projects this kind of inference in interaction, namely a candidate understanding of the meaning a co-interactant conveyed only implicitly (Deppermann & Helmer, 2013).

Particles are an important part of daily interaction. Particles are connected to language, linguistic variety, age, and register. No two are the same, neither in form nor in function (Heritage, 1984). L1 speakers use these particles, in all kinds of contexts, in very specific patterns, and without conscious knowledge of what each of these particles does. These particles perform very specific functions socially – they manage relationships, negotiate knowledge states and stances, and mitigate disagreement. In short, these "little words" are much more useful and powerful than the few phonemes of which they are composed would suggest. The current project aims to study how learners of a foreign language, in this case German, use these particles (if at all), specifically: Do learners use these particles? Do learners use them systematically? And how do learners' patterns of use compare to those of native speakers?

3 Methodology & Data

In this section I present the methodology I use in this study, conversation analysis; although I referenced some work in CA in the previous chapter, I give here a detailed discussion of both the methodological and theoretical framework of CA. I then discuss the nature of the data I use in this study, as well as the study participants (Section 3.2).

3.1 Methodology: Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) is the emic, data-driven study of the patterns of human social interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell, 2010). CA's goal is to find systematic patterns in conversation, or 'talk' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell, 2010). More precisely, CA studies human interaction, including verbal (i.e. speech) and non-verbal (e.g. gestures, gaze, posture and spatial positioning) means. Talk is a uniquely human activity, a building block for our social interaction, used "to argue, to complain, to woo, to plead, to commemorate, to denigrate, to justify, to entertain and so on" (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1). Talk is therefore much more than interactants conveying messages to one another (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998); through talk, speakers work together "to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1), and thus construct and manage social life.

The emic nature of CA is its focus on the data. Unlike other fields that study human conversation, which draw much more heavily on researchers' experience and intuition and/or create examples as part of thought experiments (see Zifonun, et al., 1997), CA research is primarily done on detailed transcripts of recordings of everyday conversations in a variety of institutional and non-institutional settings (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell, 2010). As a result, CA is firmly rooted in the visible data (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

The goal of CA is not to uncover speakers' intentions behind their utterances; rather, CA attends to the ways interactants orient themselves to each other's utterances (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). CA practitioners empirically study conversational (e.g. turn-taking) and social structure (e.g. epistemic positioning, affect, social self- and other-categorization) as it *emerges from the data*, that is, as interactants display it as relevant to each other and thus co-create it (Sidnell, 2010; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). More specifically, CA does not begin with assumptions of the roles that structures external to an interaction will play in said interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Instead, CA views structure and its role in interaction not as a series of limitations placed upon interactants, but as relevant for the design of their talk and for the success of interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). CA is therefore both a methodology for describing interaction *and* an approach to conceptualizing it; "[it] is characterized by the view that how talk is produced and how the meanings of that talk are determined are the practical, social and interactional accomplishments of members of a culture" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1).

I will use the following transcript, taken from Sidnell (2010), to illustrate the analytic approach and to show how much can be garnered from a few lines of transcript. In this segment, Ann and Jeff, a married couple, had just finished entertaining two old friends of theirs and their young child for an overnight visit (Sidnell, 2010, p. 2). After an extended series of farewells, the couple departed in the early afternoon and Ann and Jeff re-entered their house, at which time the following exchange occurred:

Example 4: Visit - FN (Sidnell, 2010, p. 2)

```
01   Ann:   That was fun
02          (0.4)
03   Jeff:  mm
04   Ann:   ish.
```

When analyzing conversation, we must consider the turns interactants take as a sequence of actions. In line 01, Ann is positively assessing their time with their friends. An assessment from an interactant makes relevant a second assessment from their co-interactant, either an agreement with the assessment (through an upgrade) (Pomerantz, 1984); or a disagreement. The two possible response options are not equal, however: Agreement is socially preferred over disagreement (Sidnell, 2010). However, after the silence in line 02, Jeff's response in line 03 constitutes neither; with the *mm* in line 03, Jeff is withholding agreement. By withholding agreement, Jeff is essentially displaying disagreement with Ann's original assessment, at least with the assessment's current form. This becomes clear in line 04, in which Ann continues and in this continuation re-designs her assessment from line 01. She downgrades the assessment from *fun* to *funish* in response to Jeff's withholding agreement in line 03. Most importantly, Jeff's *mm* and Ann's *ish* and the actions they complete can only be understood if they are analyzed within the larger sequence in which they occur. When using CA, the entire sequence is integral to understanding what interactants are doing in particular moments of an interaction (Heritage, 1984).

The "orderly and meaningful communication" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1) is achieved through the turn taking system inherent to human interaction (Sidnell, 2010). By inherent it is meant that this turn taking system is not governed by a source exterior to interaction, such as rules of politeness or a human referee[8]; rather, the rules governing this system appear to be as inherent to human interaction as the system itself, and serve to

[8] Certain kinds of interaction are, however, refereed: for example, in classroom interactions, the teacher will sometimes control who is allowed to speak, i.e. who can take a turn when; in formal debates, the mediator will play a similar role (Sidnell, 2010).

"minimize both gaps in which no one is talking and overlaps in which more than one person is talking at the same time" (Sidnell, 2010, p. 10). The question becomes, however, how do interactants determine when a co-interactant's turn has come to its end? More specifically, how do interactants know when it is their turn to speak?

Turns are composed of *turn constructional units*, or *TCUs*, and the end of each TCU in a turn is a point at which a speaker change can occur (Sidnell, 2010). Understanding the difference between turns and TCUs is essential, not only to my analyses, but to CA in general (Sidnell, 2010). For example, in the following excerpt taken from my own data, Elena (E) makes a request for information; her turn, however, consists of two TCUs, and is possibly complete at three points.

Example 5: Macht ihr das oft?

26	E:	MACHT ihr das wirklich in kanada oft?
27		also (ESST/ISST) ihr das oft zum $_1$[frühstück?
28	D:	$_1$[ä:hm::,
29	E:	oder SAGt]$_1$ man das nur.
30	D:	]$_1$

In line 26, Elena makes a request for information, asking if a particular activity is done often in Canada. This line is a complete TCU; syntactically, any speaker of German would perceive this is a complete sentence. The rising intonation of the line also matches the intonation of a request for information done through a question in German. Syntax and intonation work together to make Elena's turn recognizable as possibly complete, i.e. another of the conversation's interactants can begin the next turn relevant in the interaction, namely a response to Elena's request for information.

However, in line 27, Elena utters another complete TCU, thereby extending her turn (*also (ESST/ISST) ihr das oft zum frühstück?*); again, this request is syntactically complete,

and the rising final intonation again matches that of a typical German question. The request for information in this line is a redoing[9] of the request in line 26. In line 28 it is apparent that Dave interpreted this as the end of Elena's turn, beginning a turn and displaying his intention to respond to Elena's request for information in line 27.

In line 29, despite Dave's utterance in line 28, Elena adds another element to her TCU in line 27, recasting line 27 as the first part of a complex, two-part TCU. Syntactically, this is not a new TCU; the use of the conjunction *oder* connects it syntactically to her utterance in line 27. At the end of this line Elena's turn is again both syntactically and prosodically possibly complete, this time with the final falling intonation typical of German assertive clauses, and another point at which a speaker change can occur. The next relevant action is a response to the candidate understanding in line 29, that is, a confirmation or disconfirmation or its propositional content. The above example serves to demonstrate what turns are in interaction, how turns are composed, and at what point a turn can be interpreted as complete and a speaker change can occur. The principle of turn-taking is a central feature of human interaction and, as a result, plays a central role in understanding my data (Sidnell, 2010).

Early research in CA focused exclusively on native speaker interactions, but it has since been applied to second-language research, especially classroom interaction (see Doehler, 2013; Lauzon & Doehler, 2013; Seedhouse, 1997). The present study investigates L2 interaction during study abroad, an area of second-language study in which there is little CA research to date (see, e.g. Behrent, 2010). Previous research in language acquisition during study abroad has typically used quantitative methods, such as

[9] I discuss line 27 of this example in further detail in Section 4.3.1

standardized testing (e.g. Klapper & Rees 2003's use of C-test along with grammar tests to study the acquisition of German grammar during time abroad on Germany), communicative language tasks (e.g. Fernandez 2013's use of corpus data from learners orally completing a variety tasks, such as narratives or interviews, to study the learners' of Spanish use of vague language in the target language). More recently, researchers have used these kinds of data alongside qualitative data on the experience of learners in the target-language-culture and learners' interactions in the target language (e.g. Brown 2013's study on learners of Korean's use of Korean honorifics after experiencing the complex hierarchy of Korean's honorific system as foreign learners of Korean during their study abroad in Korea).

In the current project I analyze the interactions between two German L1 speakers and four Canadian learners of German studying abroad in Germany. The focus of my study is their use of the German particle *also*. The choice of *also* as the focus of study was based primarily on the prevalence of its production within the data in comparison with other particles. While CA is not quantitative but rather qualitative, having a large number of instances of a conversation practice to analyze allows conversation analysts to decipher what is and is not a feature of the practice (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The goal of studying a conversational practice, such as the use of a particle such as the German *also*, is to be able to provide a generalizable description of the practice; having a larger number of instances of the practice to analyze allows for this kind of description (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Because of *also*s prevalence in the data, achieving a generalizable description of L2 speakers of German's use of a particle in the target language was most possible by focussing on *also*.

While previous work in CA has already described patterns of particle use in native speakers of German, including response particles (e.g. Golato & Betz's 2008 study of the roles of *ach* and *achso* in negotiating knowledge asymmetries in interaction) and discourse particles (e.g. Deppermann & Helmer 2013's comparison of *also* and *dann* in formulating inferences based on interactants' common ground v. drawing consequences of a co-interactant's reported actions), as well as L2 speakers' particle use in the language learning classroom (e.g. Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher's 2006 study on the functional equivalency of the German *also* and the English *so* from L1 English speakers in a German language classroom), there has yet to be a CA study on learners' use of German particles during study abroad. The current study, using CA methodology, aims to answer the following questions:

1) Do L2 speakers of German use particles in German interaction? If so, which ones?
2) Do L2 speakers use particles in a systematic manner? If so, is this use systematic across L2 speakers?
3) If so, does the L2 speakers' particle use match that of their L1 counterparts? Or even that of their fellow L2 speakers?

3.2 Data

In the current study I use transcripts made from audio and video recordings of German L1 speakers interacting with Canadian learners of German living and studying in a large city in Germany. In total I made four recordings, each approximately one hour long (although the recordings neither begin or end with the interaction, i.e. the recordings were started after all of the participants had arrived and finished before they had left). In all four of these recordings I took part; this was not intrusive as I was a member of the social group and was typically present at these kinds of gatherings.

At the time of the recordings, the topic of this thesis had yet to be decided, and, therefore, the participants only had a limited knowledge about the study; the only aspect of the study that had been firmly decided was its focus on the interactions between German L2 and L1 speakers, and all of the participants were aware of this focus[10]. Because no linguistic feature had been chosen as the item of study (here, the German discourse particle *also*), it is unlikely that this knowledge of the study had an impact on the manner in which the participants interacted.

In each recording four Canadian learners of German are having a meal (i.e. breakfast or afternoon coffee and cake) with L1 German speaking acquaintances of theirs (e.g. roommates and classmates). These recordings were taken approximately two months apart and over a span of nine months. Out of the four total hours of recording, I listened and made annotations to 90 minutes of recording, the entire hour of the first recording and

[10] The participants were not instructed to interact purely in the target language, here German; rather, they were instructed to interact as they normally do, in the language of their choice.

30 minutes of the fourth[11]. Out of these 90 minutes, I transcribed two three-minute segments from the first recording session, which occurred approximately two-months into the Canadians' sojourn in Germany; these two segments were not chosen at random, but rather because they both centre predominantly around single topics: in the one transcript, the Canadians are teaching the L1 speakers about maple syrup harvesting; in the other, the L1 speakers begin talking about German dialects, which develops into a discussion of Aaron's Swabian girlfriend and her studies in Canada. The choice of *also* as the feature to be studied was made after the entirety of the transcribed data was analyzed and a series of observations made. In CA, researchers are to approach data without "a particular question in mind. Indeed, conversation analysts try to avoid letting preconceptions about what may be found in some set of transcribed recordings direct their mind when first encountering the data." (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 94). This is known as "'unmotivated' looking" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 94).

In this first recording, four Canadians, Aaron (A), Dave (D), Caitlin (C) and Mary (M) having a waffle breakfast at Caitlin's with Caitlin's German roommates Elena (E) and Björn (B) in a large city in Germany. All four Canadians were studying in Germany as part of their Master's degree in German Studies and had all had German language courses as part of their undergraduate degrees; they are therefore advanced learners of German. All interactants met on a regular basis for informal interactions, and the data reflect typical interactions these four Canadians had with the German L1 speakers.

[11] The interaction during the second and third recording were predominantly in English and, therefore, were unlikely to contain many instances of German particle use on the part of any of the participants.

Here I do not discuss the cultural, geographic, or linguistic background of the participants. The goal of CA is not to explain the actions that appear in interaction in terms of cultural, societal, or state-dependent (i.e. wakefulness, health, etc.) motivation; it is "rather to describe the methods that people use for *accounting* for their own actions and those of others" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 31, empahsis in original). The use of *also* in my data is sequentially motivated, as I demonstrate in my analysis (section 4).

As we will see in the data, much of the conversation was indeed conducted in German. None of the participants were instructed to speak in German for any of the four recording sessions; this would undermine the purpose of collecting natural interactions between L2 and L1 speakers of German. They were instead instructed to interact as they normally, i.e. in the language of their choosing. There is some code-switching into English from all four Canadians and the German L1 Björn. Each of the two transcripts covers approximately 3 minutes of recorded data, and I transcribed the data using the GAT-2 guidelines for a basic transcript (see Selting, et al., 2011; Appendix A).

4 Analysis

In this section I analyze particles that appear in the transcribed data, namely the German discourse particle *also*. I begin with a brief review of CA research done on *also*; I then provide a general overview of all appearances of *also* in the data. I follow with a presentation and analysis of a series of examples to show the different ways in which both the L1 speakers and the L2 speakers used *also* in the data; here I will compare the *also*s in the data with previous research on *also* in German L1s as well as research on other particles in other languages as required.

Some examples are reprinted several times in this chapter. In each of the repeated examples, *also* appears several times, and often each of these *also*s are completing different actions. Each subsequent analysis of an example therefore focuses on a different production of *also*; repeating examples also allows the reader to become more familiar with these examples, fostering a better understanding of the sequencing and content at those moments during the interaction. For ease of reading, each new presentation of an excerpt is given a new example number, and in every example the *also* of focus is bolded, and the focus-line marked with =>.

4.1 also

In her unpublished 2004 work on *also*, Alm builds on Auer (1996) to compare the function of *also* with respect to its placement within a German sentence. Auer (1996) argues that when *also* functions as an adverb, it is syntactically integrated into the sentence and marks the sentence as being consequential to what has already been said (see Deppermann & Helmer, 2013), as a discourse particle, *also* acts as a "text-structuring device" (Alm, 2004, p. 4): It can mark repair, pre-closing (see Whittington 2008 for an analysis of *also* as a pre-pre-closing token), and can also act as a "semantically unspecific opening for a turn or move" (Auer, 1996, pp. 317-318). Auer (1996) goes on to argue that, as an adverb, *also* can occur at the beginning or in the middle of a German sentence, and is semantically integrated into the sentence; as a discourse particle, *also* only occurs at the beginning of sentence and is never semantically integrated (Auer, 1996). Alm (2004) focused on the following two functions on *also*: first, its marking of a "return to a previous topic that has been temporarily lost"; and, second, its restating of "something already obvious or inferable from the previous conversation" (p. 6). Alm (2004) found that, in interaction, *also* completes both of these actions independent of its syntactic integration or position at the beginning or middle of a sentence.

In the current study, as well as in previous CA research, several other functions of *also* have been found. For example, as discussed in Section 2.2, Deppermann and Helmer found that *also* projects the utterance of an inference based on knowledge in co-interactants' common ground. In her Master's Thesis, Whittington (2008) found that speakers use *also* as a pre-pre-closing token, to initiate word searches, to solve problems of misunderstanding through elaborations (what Whittington dubs *Recipient Design*), in unpackings, and in delicate situations. Of particular interest to the current project are her findings on *also* in unpackings and word searches, both of which appear in my data and are discussed in more detail in Sections 4.3.1 (Self-repair: Reformulations/Unpackings) and 4.3.2 (Self-Repair: Word Searches) respectively.

4.2 Overall use of *also* in the data

The German discourse particle *also* appears a total of 29 times in 6 minutes of transcribed interaction, and it is used by the L2 speakers Aaron, Dave, and Caitlin as well as by both L1 speakers (Elena and Björn). According Hentschel & Weydt's (1989) discussion on discourse particles, *also* only appears at turn beginnings or mid-turn, but not at turn ends; similarly, *also* also appears only at TCU beginnings or mid-TCU, but not typically at TCU ends. This holds for my data as well. In the tables below is a summary of the speakers' *also* use as well as the turn and TCU positioning of *also* in my data:

Table 1: Number of *also* utterances by speaker

Speaker	Number of *also* utterances
L2s	
Aaron	14
Dave	6
Caitlin	1
L1s	
Björn	2
Elena	6
Total number of *also* utterances	29

Table 2: Number of *also* utterances by turn and TCU positioning

Turn Position	Number of *also* utterances
Beginning	4
Mid	25
TCU Position	
Beginning	17
Mid	11
Total	29

While Aaron uttered *also* a total of 14 times in the 6 minutes of transcribed data, all of these utterances occur mid-turn; Dave, who only uttered the discourse particle 6 times, uttered it twice at turn beginnings and 4 times mid-turn. The L1 speakers also show use of *also* at both turn beginnings and mid-turn, Björn uttering it once in each position and Elena once at a turn beginning and 5 times mid-turn.

While Aaron's *also* utterances occur exclusively mid-turn, he does utter it both at TCU beginnings (5 times) and mid-TCU (8 times); Dave also utters *also* in both TCU positions, 4 times at TCU beginnings and twice mid-TCU. The L1 speakers, however, utter

also exclusively at TCU beginnings, Björn twice and Elena 6 times. In Table 3 below is a summary of the interactants' utterances of *also* by turn and TCU position.

Table 3: Number of *also* utterances by speaker and turn & TCU positioning

	Turn Position		TCU position	
Speaker	**Beginning**	**Mid**	**Beginning**	**Mid**
L2 Speakers				
Aaron	0	14	5	9
Dave	2	4	4	2
Caitlin	0	1	0	1
L1 Speakers				
Björn	1	1	2	0
Elena	1	5	6	0

Also appears in 4 different kinds of sequential and action environments in the data, namely: in self-repairs, specifically unpackings/reformulations and word searches; at the beginning of multi-unit turns; and at the beginning of "non-straightforward responses" (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). Aaron is the only participant to utter *also* in all four sequence types. Dave, by contrast, did not utter *also* in multi-unit turns, and Elena only uttered *also* in unpackings/reformulations and multi-unit turns. I have summarized my findings on the utterances of *also* in each sequence type by speaker in the table below.

Table 4: Number of *also* utterances by speaker and sequence type[12]

Speaker	Unpacking/ Reformulation	Word Searches	Multi-Unit Turn	Nonstraightforward Response
L2 Speakers				
Aaron	4	5	1	1
Dave	2	1	0	3
L1 Speakers				
Björn	0	0	2	0
Elena	4	0	1	0

I will now discuss each of these sequences individually as they appear in the data, providing quantitative information on both the number of *also* utterance by speaker and by turn and TCU positioning, as well as detailed analyses of examples of these kinds of *also* from the transcribed data in order to better understand the interactional functions *also* seems to serve.

4.3 Repair

The first two kinds of *also*-containing sequences I discuss in my analysis, Unpacking/Reformulation and Word Searches, are both types of repair sequences. I begin here with a description of repair, including its possible interactional function, its structures,

[12] Caitlin's singular *also* utterance was surrounded by unintelligible utterances in the data; it was therefore not possible to determine what kind of sequence in which it occurred. There were also 4 other utterances of *also* which did not fall into one of the four above categories, and nor did they share enough features to be organized into their own category, and were thus excluded from Table 4.

and how it is meaningful to the understanding of interaction, using examples throughout to demonstrate the principles of repair I discuss here.

Human interaction is not always without its problems; difficulties of hearing, speaking, or understanding arise often in day-to-day interactions (Sidnell, 2010). Difficulties of hearing, for example, occur when an co-interactant was unable to hear what another person has said (due to background noise, for example); co-interactants have troubles in speaking when they select the wrong[13] word when speaking, or cannot find (i.e. do not have access to) the correct word (Sidnell, 2010). And troubles of understanding can arise when a hearer does not recognize a word uttered, they have not picked up on the topic of conversation, or "cannot parse the grammatical structure of an utterance" (Sidnell,

[13] It is important to note that, in terms of repair in everyday interactional settings, "wrong" does not refer to a breach of a set of prescriptive, stylistic, or grammatical rules (although this could also regularly motivate repair in certain other settings, for example in classroom interaction; see). By initiating repair, interactants indicates that, from their perspective, there is a problem (or something wrong) with the talk in terms of the interaction underway. While this idea of wrong does include stylistic and grammatical errors, it is more fruitful to discuss wrong in term of the appropriateness of the form of the talk (its understandability, interpretability, alignment) in relation to the interactional project and goals of the speakers.

2010, p. 110; Kitzinger, 2013; Egbert, 2009). In order to address, that is, make visible and rectify such a problem, co-interactants perform what is called "repair" (Sidnell, 2010).

A repair sequence consists of three units: the repair initiation, the trouble source, and the repair completion. In order to repair a trouble in talk, an interactant must break talk that is underway; this break is the repair initiation, and there are several practices, that is, recurrent patterns, to initiate a repair, e.g.: cut-offs, pauses, hesitation markers such as the English *uh* or the German *äh*, or, as Whittington (2008) argues, linguistic particles (see Kitzinger, 2013; Egbert, 2009).

The repair initiation does not only signal that a repair is being carried out. By initiating a repair, the interactant indicates that there has been a problem in the interaction (called the *trouble source* or the *repairable*) and, by initiating a repair, makes the trouble source visible (Sidnell, 2010; Kitzinger, 2013; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). For example, in the case of troubles of hearing, an interactant would indicate to a co-interactant that they did not hear part of their talk by initiating a repair on the unheard talk.

The *trouble source* is visible in the interaction itself, and is not to be confused with the *source of trouble*, or the reason for the trouble source requiring repair (Sidnell, 2010; Kitzinger, 2013). If a problem of hearing arises due to excessive ambient noise, the ambient noise is the source of the trouble, but, interactionally, cannot be repaired; the talk that was

not heard due to the ambient noise is then the trouble source, and must be repaired in the interaction.

Once an interactant initiates a repair, interactants can employ one of several repair technologies (e.g. repeat, replacement, expansion, pre-empting or correcting an unwanted hearing, etc.) to complete said repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977); the chosen technology depends on the type of trouble source. For example, to repair a problem of hearing, speakers typically provide an identical or modified repeat of the unheard talk. A problem of understanding can be repaired in several ways, depending on how much of the talk a speaker did not understand; for example, in *wer? der kleine?*, taken from Egbert (2004), Ralf initiates a repair in line 03 on Rita's turn in line 01 using a candidate understanding.

Example 6: wer? der kleine? (Egbert, 2004, p. 1484)

```
01    Rita:   will er nich?
02    Anna:   nein
03  =>Ralf:   wer? der kleine?
```

In line 01 Rita makes a request for confirmation, asking if the male to whom she is referring does not want to do something. In line 02, Anna confirms that indeed the male does not want to, using the negative response particle; in line 03, a third interactant, Ralf, shows that he is unsure about whom Rita and Anna were talking, uttering the question word *wer;* in the same line, he offers a candidate understanding (*der kleine?*), showing he possibly

understands who is the topic of conversation. Ralf's candidate understanding makes relevant either a confirmation from one of the other interactants, indicating that his understanding is correct, or a disconfirmation coupled with a correction, here the male to whom Rita and Anna were referring in Egbert (2004).

In the following example, also from Egbert (2004), Caller calls the deutsche Telekom, asking for a phone number from Bremen, Germany. In line 20 and 21 the Caller makes a request for information, stating they would like a phone number from the registration office in *blemen*; this is a direct repeat of a request for information the Caller made prior to the beginning, which was answered with an incorrect candidate understanding by the Telekom operator.

Example 7: blemen meldeamt (Egbert, 2004, p. 1488)

```
20  Caller:    ich müchte eine telefonnummer von blemen
21             meldeamt haben.
22             (0.5)
23    Telekom:  °tz° ((smacks lips))
24               (0.2)
25    Caller:    verstehn sie mich?
26               (0.8)
27  =>Telekom:  .hh von- nee- könn'n sie mal buchstabieRen?
```

After pausing in lines 22 and 24, and the operator smacking their lips in line 23, the caller makes a request for information in line 25, asking whether the Telekom operator can

understand them. After another pause in line 26, the Telekom operator shows that she did not understand where or whom the caller would like to connect by requesting a spelling of the caller's target.

Unlike Ralf's candidate understanding in line 03 in *wer? der kleine*, which indicated Ralf had an understanding problem the operator's repair initiation in line 26, a requests for spelling, shows, at most, that the operator has understood the caller had uttered the name of a place reachable by telephone. The operator's repair initiation in line 27 does not make relevant a confirmation, as does a candidate understanding; a successful repair here would require, at the very least, some sort of repeat on the part of the caller, possibly even a reformulation of his request (Kitzinger, 2013).

The previous two examples contained other-initiated repair. Research on repair has shown, however, that overall, there is a strong preference[14] for the speaker of the trouble

[14] While Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) appear to base their definition of "preference" for self-repair on relative frequencies of self-repair and other-repair, namely that self-repair appears more often in interaction than does other-repair, Bilmes (1988) defines preference in terms of relevant actions and their absences: "certain contexts make relevant some preferred action. When that action is not taken, it is relevantly absent" (Bilmes, 1988, p. 164). That is, if an action makes relevant a certain action, a certain preferred action; if that action is not taken, then interactants infer that the opposite of the preferred action is being completed (Bilmes, 1988). For example, if an interactant produces an assessment, which makes

source to both initiate and carry out repair, i.e. a preference for self-initiated repair (as opposed to other-initiated repair) and for self-completed repair (as opposed to other-completed repair) (Kitzinger, 2013; Sidnell, 2010; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Schegloff, 1979; Egbert, 2009). In the case of self-initiation, the preference is, in part, due to the position of the initiation with relation to the trouble source (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Sidnell, 2010), because the speaker of the trouble source has the first/earliest chance to initiate repair on her talk. In interaction speakers are given the right to speak until they have reached a point at which their turn is possibly complete, i.e. until they have uttered a complete TCU (Sidnell, 2010). Therefore, when a repair is other-initiated, the other must wait until the TCU is complete before initiating a repair, i.e. the repair initiation occurs in the next turn (Sidnell, 2010; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Since trouble sources typically occur mid-TCU, initiating a repair in the following turn leaves a gap between the trouble source and the initiation (Sidnell, 2010; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Even when repair is other-initiated, there is still a preference for self-repair; in the case of other-initiation, the repair itself would take place in the turn following the initiation,

---

relevant an agreement (in the shape of an upgraded second assessment in most interactional settings, see Pomerantz, 1984; Auer & Uhmann, 1982) from co-interactants, anything other than an agreement via upgrade is taken as (partial) disagreement.

two turns after the turn containing the trouble source. Repair is most effective when it is initiated and carried out within the same turn as the trouble source: Upon producing a trouble source, a speaker can put the turn on hold in order to initiate and carry out repair, giving them the first chance to repair their talk (Sidnell, 2010; Kitzinger, 2013; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Betz, 2008).

Other-completion is also dispreferred, even when a repair is other-initiated (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). However, this dispreference, unlike the dispreference for other-initiation, is related primarily to social factors rather than to the structure of interaction. Other-correction, for example, regardless of the intention of the correcting interactant, "are often treated by the participants as constituting, or at least preliminary to, disagreement" (Sidnell, 2010, p. 113).

While other-initiated repair is performed on talk that has already been uttered in the interaction, the initiation occurring in the turn following the trouble source turn, being therefore *backward-looking*, self-repair can also be done on talk that has yet to be uttered. In the case of word searches (which I will discuss in further detail below), the trouble source is not talk that has already entered the interaction, but rather a lexical item access to which the speaker does not currently have; i.e. the repair is performed on talk occurring after the repair initiation (rather than prior to the initiation). The search operation is

therefore both to buy the speaker time to regain access to the item and the regaining of access itself, and the solution to the repair operation the missing lexical item. Repairs such as word searches can therefore be understood as *forward-looking* (Schegloff, 1979).

Of particular interest to the current project is self-initiated self-repair, namely, how self-repair is communicated to co-interactants, since the repair sequences containing *also* are predominantly both self-initiated and self-repaired. How do interactants communicate that they are initiating and performing repair and not continuing the talk that was underway? How do hearers parse self-repair from the rest of talk, and how do they know when a repair sequence has been completed and the original talk being continued? As I will demonstrate, both L1s and L2s use particles to mark repair, and the function of these particles depends on the kind of repair sequences in which they are uttered. My analysis shows that L1s and L2s use the German discourse particle *also* in two kinds of self-repair, reformulations/unpackings and word searches. However, the function of the particle in each of these repair sequences differs. In the first context, *also* serves to mark and project a reformulation/unpacking, while in word searches, it indicates that the searched-for lexical item has been found and thus projects the production of the word search solution.

4.3.1 Self-repair: Reformulations/Unpackings

When reformulating or unpacking, the speaker redoes a previous turn or previous unit of the current turn, at least in part, marking the original turn as containing an ambiguous or non-specific piece of information requiring disambiguation or specification for the interaction to continue, "pre-empting possible problems of understanding" (Mondada, 2015, p. 52). In the case of reformulations, a speaker does this by redesigning their turn, completing the same action but changing its format. When unpacking, a speaker replaces part of their previous turn or TCU, for example: a pronoun with a specific noun or name (e.g. *er* to *Apfel*), a generic verb with a more descriptive verb (e.g. *machen* to *essen*), or a longer series of words, as we will see in the examples below. The precise form that a reformulation/unpacking takes "depends on the sequential environment in which it is achieved" (Mondada, 2015, p. 52).

In the data *also* appears a total of 10 times in reformulations or unpackings, from L2 speakers Aaron and Dave as well as from L1 speaker Elena. In reformulations and unpackings *also* occurs exclusively mid-turn, but at both TCU beginnings and mid-TCU. The tables below present a summary of the speakers' utterances of *also* in reformulations and unpackings, as well as *also*'s turn and TCU positioning.

Table 5: Number of *also* utterances appearing in reformulations/unpackings by speaker

Speaker	Number of also utterances
L2 speakers	
Aaron	4
Dave	2
L1 speakers	
Elena	4
Total	10

In the following example, Elena (E), Aaron (A), Dave (D), and Caitlin (C) are discussing the harvesting of maple syrup, specifically the tap used to harvest sap from maple trees.

Example 8: Wie macht ihr das?

```
01    E:       ([xxx    ])-
02         JA aber ähm- (.)
03         <<right arm extended with palm upwards, index finger
           extended> wie MACHT ihr das,>
           E shifts gaze to D
04         <<right moved horizontal to vertical, maintaining
           hand shape> dass die bäume nicht ABsterben,>
05    A:   <<muffled> mm>.
           B shifts gaze to D, then to A
           E shifts gaze to A
06    E:   (macht ihr/macht man [nur ein BISSchen]).
07    A:                       [es ist ist NUR  ] dieses [ähm (.) ]
08    D:                                                 [ja genau]
09    A:   ein klein(e/er) so
10    C:   <<in English> yeah (-) in the west
```

```
11          [<<quietly> it's too COLD>          ]
12    A:    [NÄgeln: (<<in English> which uh:>)]
            *E briefly shifts gaze to C while she is speaking, and then
            back to A*
13    C:    <<in English> for the MAples.>
14  =>A:    also die SEhen so:-
15          diese sehen so wie NÄgeln aus,
16          [habm: ]
17    E:    [hm_hm,]
18    A:    also (.) kleine LÖcher?
19    E:    MACHt man einfach rein [(ganz rein)].
20    A:                           [(auf solch)]
21          man MACHt
22          ja man MACHT das einfach rein;=
```

In line 03, Elena begins a request for information (*wie MACHT ihr das,*), completing it in line 04 (*dass die bäume nicht ABsterben,*), during which her gaze shifts to Dave, making a response from Dave relevant. In line 06, Elena offers a candidate understanding, constituting a possible response to her own question: Only a little sap is actually taken from the tree. In line 08, Dave confirms Elena's possible candidate understanding with an utterance of the response token *ja genau*; meanwhile, in line 07, Aaron has begun to describe a maple syrup tap (*es ist ist NUR dieses ähm (.)*), which he continues with a partial

restart in line 09 (*ein klein(e/er) so*) and finishes in line 12 (*NÄgeln*)[15]. The additional talk in the same turn (possibly the relative pronoun *which*) seems to mark a brief switch into English and project further talk by Aaron.

Caitlin meanwhile begins to make a claim in English about maple syrup harvesting in Western Canada, beginning in line 10 (*yeah (-) in the west*) with a reference to a geographical location; she continues in line 11 and line 13 referring to the weather in Western Canada and temperature requirements for the prosperity of maple trees (*it's too COLD for the MAples*).

In line 12, with the utterance of *uh:,* Aaron initiates a repair sequence; in lines 14 and 15, Aaron redoes his description of the maple syrup tap, essentially reformulating his turn in lines 07, 09, and 12. He begins this new TCU in line 14 with ***also*** and with *die sehen so:*, projecting a description of the tap's particular appearance. He restarts this description in line 15 and completes his reformulation (*diese sehen so wie NÄgeln aus*). Here *also* is not acting as a repair initiator; the repair initiation occurs at the end of line 12 with *uh:*. Rather,

[15] It is important to note that A's utterance of *dieses* in line 08 and *ein* in line 09 both project the utterance of a noun that is singular and in nominative case. What we see instead in line 12 is a plural dative noun (NÄgeln), and Aaron repeats this form in line 15, where a plural nominativ noun is projected by *sehen so:- wie* (*aus*).

also prefaces the utterance of the repair solution, here a reformulation in lines 14 and 15 of the turn in line 07, 09, and 12.

In line 16 and 18 Aaron describes a feature of this nail-like tap, namely that they have small holes. In line 19 Elena utters another candidate understanding of the upshot of Aaron's explanation, an understanding of what is done with the maple syrup tap to the tree (*MACHt man einfach rein (ganz rein))*. Aaron confirms Elena's candidate understanding with a partial repeat in line 21 and a response token and modified repeat in line 22 (*ja man MACHT das einfach rein*).

In the following, shorter example, we see inter-L2 speaker consistency in terms of prefacing a reformulation or unpacking with *also*. Here, Dave contributes to the maple syrup discussion with a statement regarding the kind of maple tree whose sap is used to make maple syrup. Dave begins a new sequence in line 23 and line 24, asserting that there is only kind of maple tree from which maple syrup can be made.

Example 9: Ahornbäume

23		D:	es gibt denn nur EINen TYP von (-)
			B shifts gaze to D
24		D:	also Ahorn(-)bäume.
25	=>		**also** <<in English> SUgar maples (.) they're> (xxx).

In line 25, Dave carries out a repair on his previous turn, uttering *also*, then switching into English to provide the name of said tree. With the utterance of *SUgar maples*, the specific species of maple tree to which Dave referred in the previous lines, Dave unpacks his turn in line 23 and 24, replacing his reference to a single type of maple syrup producing tree with the name of said tree. While Dave unpacks a series of words with a noun in *Ahornbäume*, and Aaron reformulates a description in *Wie macht ihr das?* (replacing *NÄgeln* with *diese sehen so wie NÄgeln aus,*), they are both disambiguating or making a portion of the previous TCU more specific or descriptive; moreover, they project this disambiguation or specification with the discourse particle *also*.

In *Macht ihr das oft?*, Elena makes a request for information, asking whether a particular activity is done often in Canada.

Example 10 (reprint of example 5): Macht ihr das oft?

26	E:	MACHT ihr das wirklich in kanada oft?
27	=>	**also** (ESST/ISST) ihr das oft zum $_1$[frühstück?
28	D:	$_1$[ä:hm::,
29	E:	oder SAGt]$_1$ man das nur.
30	D:	]$_1$

In line 27, she utters *also* before redoing her request for information, now unpacking *MACHT* and *das*, asking whether *das* is eaten often for breakfast in Canada. While to what

das refers in the example is not clear, both previous interaction as well as the fact that the activity in which they are partaking is the consumption of waffles with maple syrup for breakfast, we can conclude that Elena here is referring to the current dish: Waffles with maple syrup. In line 29 Elena ultimately offers the possibility that her request for information in lines 26 and 27 amounts to a stereotype that is shared by several people about Canadians (*oder SAGt man das nur*.); this is a face-saving move on Elena's part. Her request for information in lines 26 and 27 is based on a stereotype of Canadian's large maple syrup consumption, based in hearsay only and not in first-hand experience with Canadian customs and culture; this ignorance could possibly threaten Elena's face. In line 29, by referring to an ambiguous group of people who believe the same stereotype and, as a result, may share Elena's lack of direct experience, Elena is effectively downgrading her own epistemic stance by distancing herself from her original proposition.

Both forms of the request for information, the original in line 26 and the unpacked version in line 27, make relevant either a confirmation or disconfirmation from any of the Canadians in the interaction (note the address term *ihr*); in line 28, however, Dave both indicates his readiness to respond to the request for information and projects the utterance of a response not made relevant by the request (response discussed later in more detail, see section 4.4).

In this third example we again have a reformulation or unpacking prefaced by *also*; in all of the example I presented, as well as the other instances of *also* in reformulations/unpackings in my six minutes of transcripts, the speaker replaces some part of their previous turn they determined was too imprecise or ambiguous for their co-interactants: In *Wie macht ihr das*?, Aaron's reformulation from *NÄgeln* in line 12 to an nail-like appearance in lines 14, 15, and 16 indicates he predicted possible confusion as to what maple syrup taps are and how they work; in *Ahornbäume*, Dave's unpacking of his turn in lines 23 and 24 with the name of the tree to which he was referring, *SUgar maples*, was more descriptive than a reference to a generic kind of tree; and Elena reformulating her question in *Macht ihr das oft?* is a move pre-empting any possible confusion for her co-interactants as to what exactly she is asking about.

However, this use of *also* is not a correction motivated by a perceived lack in L2 competence: In *Macht ihr das oft* it is an L1 speaker, Elena, using *also* in this manner, indicating both Aaron and Dave's above described reformulation-and-unpacking-prefacing *also*s may be target-like. It is important to note, however, that both Aaron and Dave's utterance of *also* occur next to code switches on the part of the speaker, Aaron possibly switching from English in line 12 (*(which uh:)*) and then switching back to German for his reformulation in line 14 (***also*** *die SEhen so:-*), and Dave switching to English in line 25 when

unpacking his previous two lines (***also*** *Sugar maples*). Code switching, however, is not necessarily a feature of the L2 speakers' use of *also* in reformulations and unpackings; instead, it is one strategy for repair available to these speakers. In the following example, Elena makes a request for information with regards to the geographic location of maple syrup production. The focus turn is in line 45.

Example 11: Ein bestimmtes wetter

```
          E shifts gaze to D
31   E:   (gibt es) nur in QUEbec (.) ähm:-
32        ahornsyrup en werk[stätten in der gegend] oder.
33   D:                     [ahm:                 ]
          C shifts gaze to D
34   C:   ei (.) ein BISSchen in (.) in <<with canadian accent> ontario>.
          B shifts gaze to D
35   D:   <<quickly> ja ein bisschen in ontario>=
36        =ich [BRAUCH]=
37   A:        [(xxx) ]
38   D:    =also es GIBT ein (-)
39        bestimmtes WES (.) WETter [das             ] man dafür braucht
40   C:                             [<<nodding>hm_hm>]
41   A:   ((clears throat))
          E, C, and B shift gaze to D
42 =>A:   [es IST  ] also ein bisschen
```

```
43    C:    [und auch]
44          die BÄUMe; [find (sich) nur     ]
45  =>A:               [es (is/i) al (al/so)]_so es muss ein bisschen WÄRMer
            als a::h-
            C gets up and walks to counter
46    E:    im [WESTen]
47    A:       [null  ] grad-
48    E:    <<nods> hm_hm>
49    A:    (.) am MORgens und am=
50          =am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.
```

In lines 31 and 32 Elena makes a request for information, asking if only the Canadian province of Quebec has maple syrup producers; Elena's gaze shift directly prior to her request make a response from Dave relevant. In line 33, Dave indicates his intention to speak with *ahm:*, in partial overlap with Elena's utterance in line 32. Caitlin, however, is the first to respond, partially disconfirming Elena's request for information by, in line 34, claiming the existence of sugar shacks in Quebec's western provincial neighbour, Ontario. Caitlin's gaze shift prior to this claim constitutes a request to Dave to confirm her claim in line 34. Dave confirms her claim in line 35 with the affirmative response token *ja* and a repeat of Caitlin's turn in line 34 (*ein bisschen in ontario*). Dave then starts a new TCU in

line 36 (*ich BRAUCH*), before restarting in line 38 (*also*[16] *es GIBT ein (-)*). In lines 38 and 39 Dave claims there is a requisite weather for maple syrup production, with which Caitlin aligns in line 40, uttering *hm_hm* coupled with a nod.

In line 41 Aaron clears his throat, both preparing his vocal organs to speak and indicating his readiness to speak. In line 42 Aaron begins a description of the said requisite weather (*es IST* ***also*** *ein bisschen*); however, in line 43, Caitlin simultaneously begins a claim as to the geographic location in which maple syrup producing trees are found. She continues this claim in line 44; she gives up her turn, however, not having uttered a complete TCU by the end of 44, at which point she gets up and leaves the table. Aaron, in line 45 met with competition for the floor from Caitlin, restarts his turn from line 42, repeating the syllables of *also* until the overlap ends, at which point he continues with his description of the requisite maple syrup producing weather (*es (is/i)* ***al (al/so)_so*** *es muss ein bisschen WÄRMer*).

At the end of line 45, Aaron initiates a word search with *a::h*, to which Elena offers a possible solution in line 46 (*im WESTen*); in line 46, Elena is relying on knowledge she learned from Caitlin about Western Canada, namely that it generally has colder weather than does Eastern Canada, as well as Aaron's utterance of *WÄRMer* in the previous line,

[16] I will discuss this *also* and its function in projecting nonstraightforward responses in Section 4.4.

when offering this possible solution to Aaron's word search in line 45. Aaron, in line 47, utters the solution to the word search (*null grad*), referring to a temporal requirement to this requisite temperature in lines 49 and 50 (*(.) am MORgens und am= =am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter*)..

Aaron, in lines 45, 47, 49, 50, is unpacking a previous turn, however it is not his own turn that he unpacks. Aaron is unpacking Dave's responsive turn in lines 38 and 39; disambiguating the reference to a requisite weather (*es GIBT ein (-) bestimmtes WES (.) WETter das man dafür braucht)* with a description of the requisite weather (*es muss ein bisschen WÄRmer als a::h- null grad- (.) am MORgens and am- - am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.*). And Aaron prefaces this unpacking with an *also*, both in his first attempt at this turn in line 42 and its restart in line 45. However, unlike the L2 speakers Aaron and Dave's *also*s in *Wie macht ihr das?* and *Ahornbäume*, there is no code switching in the sequence surrounding this *also*-projected unpacking; it is entirely in German. The lack of code-switching in this example along with its similar absence in Elena's utterance of *also* in *Macht ihr das oft?* further supports the argument that *also* projects the utterance of a repair in the form of a reformulation or unpacking of a previous turn or TCU, and that in these kinds of repairs, code-switching is not the only strategy that L2 speakers use.

In this section we have seen that both L1 and L2 speakers of German use *also* to project the reformulation or the unpacking of a portion of a previous turn or TCU in order to provide a more specific or less ambiguous piece of information. In *Wie macht ihr das?*, Aaron reformulates a description of a maple syrup tap, thereby providing more detailed description of its appearance and workings; in *Ahornbäume*, Dave unpacks a reference to a general type/genus of maple syrup producing tree (*Ahornbäume*) with the name of a specific species (*SUgar maple*), thereby more specifically informing his co-interactants and displaying the relevance of categorizing different maple species for the interaction at hand; in *Macht ihr das oft?*, Elena unpacks part of a request for information in order to repair an epistemic stance conveyed; and in *Ein bestimmtes wetter*, Aaron unpacks Dave's reference to provide a more specific description of the requisite maple syrup producing weather, thereby disambiguating Dave's response to a request for information from Elena. All of these examples of reformulations and unpackings are prefaced with the German discourse particle *also*.

In her work on *also*, Whittington (2008) found that, in unpackings, *also* does not act as the repair initiator. In cases of unpackings prefaces with *also,* she found that other elements acted as repair initiators, such as lengthenings, pauses, and cut-offs, and that *also*'s function in unpackings is to "hold the floor for the current speaker so that the repair

can be made by that speaker" (Whittington, 2008, p. 50), in this case, so that the speaker can provide a reformulation/unpacking of a previous utterance; I argue, however, that this grossly underestimates (that is, underspecifies) the function of *also* in these sequences.

In interaction, speakers have access to a myriad of devices with which they can maintain the floor: lengthening of words, hesitation markers such as *uh*, expressions such as *warte mal*, *ich meine*, *wait a sec*, etc. The fact that *also* occurs directly prior to unpackings and reformulations in both my data and Whittington (2008)'s examples without being lengthened, which would serve to maintain the floor, points to a projecting function rather than to a floor holding function, a projecting function that both the L1 and the L2 speakers display in my data.

In this section I showed how both the L1s and the L2s in my data use *also* to project the utterance of a reformulation or unpacking,; returning to my research questions from section 3.1, this is an example of L2 speakers' using a particle in the L2, but an example of systematic use, and a use of *also* observed in L1 speakers' interactions. This is, however, only one function of *also*; in the following section I discuss another use of *also* in repair, namely *also* in word searches in German, that is, in forward-looking self-repair.

4.3.2 Self-Repair: Word Searches

When a speaker does a word search in interaction, they are indicating that they do not have access to a certain lexical item and require processing time in order to regain access to said item (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). While it is not possible to know using CA whether the lost access is due to some lapse in memory or some other cognitive failure (Sidnell, 2010), by doing a word search an interactant displays as a lapse in memory or access.

Unlike other kinds of repair, which act on previous talk in the interaction, word searches act on talk that has yet to be produced; word searches are, therefore, a forward-looking repair operation (Schegloff, 1979, Betz, 2008). Word searches consist of three parts: "(1) The search initiation, (2) the search process, and (3) the end or resolution of the search." (Betz, 2008, p. 99). Speakers typically mark the repair initiation with a repair initiator; e.g. in English a speaker can mark a word search with an *uh* (Schegloff, 1979), or in German with *äh*. The search process itself is both of variable length and success, and speakers may indicate a need for assistance from their co-interactants if they predict an unsuccessful outcome to the word search underway (Betz, 2008). The talk directly preceding the initiation of the word search syntactically projects what can constitute a word search solution (Betz, 2008). The solution, however, is not always satisfactory to the speaker who initiated the search; in order to allow the interaction to continue, a speaker can utter either "an approximation of the searched-for item" or even a "'stand-in' or place

holder for an item yet to be produced" (Betz, 2008, p. 101), thus providing information about the type of solution that has been reached.

In the data used for this study there are 5 instances of *also*-containing word searches. Only two speakers, Aaron and Dave, use *also* in word searches. In these word searches *also* appeared exclusively mid-turn and mid-TCU. The table below summarizes the utterances of *also* in word searches by speaker.

Table 6: Number of *also* utterances appearing in word searches by speaker

Speaker	Number of *also* utterances appearing in word searches
L2s	
Aaron	4
Dave	1
Total	5

As can be seen in above table, in the data only Aaron and Dave use *also* in word searches, Aaron 4 times and Dave once. These *also*s appear exclusively mid-turn and mid-TCU. Again looking at an extended version of *Wie macht ihr das?*, we now focus on Aaron's description of the maple syrup tap in line 18.

Example 12: Wie macht ihr das? (expanded version of Example 8)

```
06   E:   (macht ihr/macht man [nur ein BISSchen]).
07   A:                      [es ist ist NUR  ] dieses [ähm (.) ]
08   D:                                                [ja genau]
09   A:   ein klein(e/er) so
10   C:   <<in English> yeah (-) in the west
11        [<<quietly> it's too COLD>         ]
```

12 A: [NÄgeln: (<<in English> which uh:>)]

E briefly shifts gaze to C while she is speaking, and then back to A

13 C: <<in English> for the MAples.>

14 A: also die SEhen so:-

15 diese sehen so wie NÄgeln aus,

16 [habm:]

17 E: [hm_hm,]

18 =>A: **also** (.) kleine LÖcher?

19 E: MACHt man einfach rein [(ganz rein)].

20 A: [(auf solch)]

21 man MACHt

22 ja man MACHT das einfach rein;=

In lines 07, 09, and 12 Aaron responds to Elena's earlier request for information; in line 12 he refers to the tap as nails. He then (as discussed above in section 4.3.1) reformulates this turn in line 14 and 15, stating what he is referring to 'looks like' nails, with a prefacing *also*. He continues this description in the following lines: In line 16, he utters *habm:*, which projects the utterance of a trait had by the nail-like maple syrup taps he is describing.; with the lengthening of *habm:* Aaron also initiates a word search, the lengthening indicating he needs more time to retrieve the missing lexical item. In line 18, he utters an *also* followed by a micro pause and the word search solution (*kleine LÖcher*). In line 19, Elena utters a candidate understanding of the proper use of the nail-like hole-having device Aaron has just described (*MACHt man einfach rein (ganz rein).*), which Aaron confirms in lines 21-22

(*man MACHt ja man MACHT das einfach rein;=*). In this example, Aaron's second *also* in line 18 (unlike his first *also* in line 14) prefaces the utterance of a word search solution.

In *Ahornbäume*, in which Dave discusses the species' of trees for maple syrup harvesting, he also utters *also* twice.

Example 13 (reprint of Example 9): Ahornbäume

```
23    D:   es gibt denn nur EINen TYP von (-)
               B shifts gaze to D
24  =>D:   also Ahorn(-)bäume.
25         also <<in English> SUgar maples (.) they're> (xxx).
```

In line 23, Dave begins the assertion that there is only one kind of something, that something having yet to be uttered in the interaction (*es gibt denn nur EINen TYP von (-)*) . The preposition *von* in line 23 projects the utterance of a noun, a plural noun in dative case; it is however first followed by a pause, suggesting that Dave does not have access to the noun and is thus initiating a word search to retrieve it (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Betz, 2008). In line 24, Dave utters *Ahorn(-)bäume*. The falling intonation on *Ahornbäume* and the fact that the item is (grammatically and pragmatically) a possible completion of Dave's turn in line 23 makes line 24 hearable as a word search solution. Thus *also* again (as in the *Wie macht ihr das?*) precedes a possible word search solution. In line 25, as discussed above, Dave utters *also* again, this time followed by an unpacking of his utterance in lines 23 and 24; this unpacking is however done through a code switch into English,

Dave's L1. This unpacking of the previous two lines, coupled with the pause within the solution, suggests trouble with the word search solution: Dave, being a L2 speaker of German, may not be certain as to the appropriateness of his choice of *Ahornbäume* in line 24, i.e., he may be uncertain as to the equivalency of *Ahornbäume* and *maple trees*. By doing the unpacking in line 25, Dave removes this uncertainty by relying on his L1 to name the tree species to which he is referring. As with reformulations and unpackings, we again have inter-L2 speaker consistency in the use of *also* in word searches. More specifically, L2 speakers appear not to use *also* to mark the initiation of the word search, but rather to project the utterance of a possible word search solution and mark the solution as a specific kind of solution. In the following example, Aaron redoes a word search solution, the second word search solution projected by *also* in line 53.

Example 14: Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben

```
46  A:    (das ist en/zem THEmen)
47          diaLEKten
48          also m:eine freundin sie kommt aus u::h SCHWAben?
49          (.)
50    All: ((laughter, approx. 0.7 sec))
51          (1.0)
52    A:    und u::h am OST=
53  =>      u:h also am OSter: kennte=
```

```
54          kenne ICH u:hm;
55          den eltern: (-) zum ERSten mal lernen.
56    E:    OH je.
57    A:    un:d_uh
58          ((laughter))
59    A:    (xxx) u::h=
60    E:    du wirst NICHTs verstehen;
```

In the above example, Aaron connects to a previous discussion of German dialects (lines 46-47) by introducing the new topic of his German girlfriend dialect region in Germany (line 48). He introduces the new topic with a prefacing *also*[17]; in the same line he initiates a word search with *u::h*, projecting the name of a geographical location with *aus*, and uttering the solution *SCHWABEn*. This story preface makes relevant a go-ahead for the projected telling from his prospective audience (Jefferson, 1978), which is provided in line 50 in the form of laughter. After the laughter in line 50 and the pause in line 51, Aaron continues the story telling by establishing the setting; in line 52 he initiates another word search with *u::h* and begins uttering a possible word search solution (*am OST*), indicating Aaron has access to the lexical item for which he was searching, whose utterance would continue the sequence in progress. However, in line 53, he abandons the solution mid-word and then

[17] I will discuss this *also* and its function in projecting multi-unit turns in more detail in section 4.5

repairs it through a restart: He initiates a second word search with *u:h*, then utters *also* followed by a repeat and completion of the word search solution uttered in line 57 (*am OSter:*). The restarting of the word search in line 53, especially since the solution had already begun being uttered in line 52 (*OST*), coupled with lengthening of the solution *OSter:* suggests uncertainty as to the appropriateness of *OSter* in this situation; similarly to Dave in *Ahornbäume*, Aaron may be indicating uncertainty as to the equivalency of *OSter* and the English *Easter*.

Aaron continues the turn in progress with the next item, required due to turn's syntactic unfolding. In line 54, Aaron performs another repair, now repairing the tense of *kennte* in line 53 from the preterit to the present form *kenne*[18]. In line 54 Aaron initiates another word search, initiating it with *u:hm*, the solution being uttered in line 55 (*den eltern:*), before finishing his turn, indicating that, at the following Easter, he will be meeting his girlfriend's Swabian parents for the first time (*zum ERSten mal lernen*). In line 56, Elena indicates the likelihood of Aaron experiencing some sort of difficulty at this first meeting (*OH je*), namely a difficulty associated with the family's Swabian origin (the laughter in line 50 supports this). In line 60, Elena indicates the difficulty she implied in line 56, namely that of understanding the Swabian dialect (*du wirst NICHTs verstehen*). This redoing of the

[18] The verb was also formed with the incorrect root for the preterit, **kennt-* instead of the correct *kannt-*.

word search, uttering *also* in its repaired version followed by the solution, which Aaron already partially uttered in the initial word search, and the marking of both the original word search in line 52 and the repaired version in line 53 with *u::h* indicate that, in word searches, *also* does not mark the initiation of the word search, but rather indicates that the speaker has regained access to the missing lexical item, projecting the utterance of said lexical item. Furthermore, an L2 speaker marks potential trouble in the word search solution, namely uncertainty as to the appropriateness of the found search solution.

Again looking at *Ein bestimmtes wetter* we now focus on the word search in line 65. This word search, however, does not contain an *also*, and thus acts as a comparison with those word searches analyzed above.

Example 15 (reprint of Example 11): Ein bestimmtes wetter

```
          E shifts gaze to D
31   E:   (gibt es) nur in QUEbec (.) ähm:-
32        ahornsyrup en werk[stätten in der gegend] oder.
33   D:                     [ahm:                 ]
          C shifts gaze to D
34   C:   ei (.) ein BISSchen in (.) in <<with canadian accent> ontario>.
          B shifts gaze to D
35   D:   <<quickly> ja ein bisschen in ontario>=
36        =ich [BRAUCH]=
37   A:        [(xxx) ]
```

```
38    D:    =also es GIBT ein (-)
39          bestimmtes WES (.) WETter [das             ] man dafür braucht
40    C:                              [<<nodding>hm_hm>]
41    A:    ((clears throat))
            E, C, and B shift gaze to D
42    A:    [es IST  ] also ein bisschen
43    C:    [und auch]
44          die BÄUMe; [find (sich) nur     ]
45  =>A:               [es (is/i) al (al/so)]_so es muss ein bisschen WÄRMer
            als a::h-
            C gets up and walks to counter
46  ->E:    im [WESTen]
47  =>A:       [null  ] grad-
48    E:    <<nods> hm_hm>
49    A:    (.) am MORgens und am=
50          =am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.
```

In lines 31 and 32 Elena asks if maple syrup is only produced in Quebec. Her gaze shift to Dave prior to the beginning of this request for information makes a response from Dave relevant. Dave, accordingly, signals his readiness to respond to this request in 33; Caitlin responds first, however, in line 34, partially disconfirming Elena's request in lines 31 and 32 by referring to the production of maple syrup in Ontario; Caitlin's gaze shift to Dave prior to her response indicates she is seeking confirmation to the claim she has just made,

which Dave provides in line 35 with the affirmative response particle *ja* followed by a repeat of Caitlin's response from line 34. In lines 36, 38, and 39, Dave responds to Elena's request for information in lines 31 and 32 by making reference to a requisite weather for maple syrup production; Caitlin shows alignment in line 40 with Dave's response (*hm_hm*). In line 41 Aaron indicates his readiness to speak by clearing his throat, and then begins an unpacking of Dave's response in line 42 (see Section 4.3.1). Due to competition for the floor with Caitlin, Aaron restarts this unpacking in line 45 (*es (is/i) al (al/so)_so es muss ein bisschen WÄRMer als a::h*-) . With *a::h* at the end on line 45, Aaron marks the initiation of a word search; Elena, making reference to what she had learned from her Western Canadian roommate Caitlin regarding the colder temperatures in the West than in the East of Canada, offers a possible word search solution in line 46 (*im WESTen*).

It is important here to note that no word search containing *also* were possibly completed by someone other than the speaker who initiated the word search; this supports the argument that *also* does not mark the initiation of a word search, but rather marks the end of the solution and projects the utterance of the solution. Once *also* has been uttered, a possible solution from another co-interactant would then be superfluous to the solution the speaker has already found, i.e. the speaker has already found a solution to their word

search and does not require one from another co-interactant. In line 45, however, there is no *also*, indicating Aaron has yet to find a solution to his word search.

In line 47, after Elena's candidate solution in line 46 to Aaron's word search initiated in line 45, Aaron utters the solution for which he was search (*null grad*), effectively deleting Elena's candidate solution from the sequence; in line 49, after Elena's *hm_hm* in line 48, Aaron continues his turn (*(.) am MORgens und am*) which, after a repair initiated with a repeat of *am*, he completes in line 50 (*am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.*). This word search solution (*null grad*) plays a role in two components of Aaron's turns: it provides a point of comparison for both the comparative adjective *WÄRMer* in line 45, and for line 50 (*am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.*), providing motivation for the use of the word search solution for which Aaron was searching rather than just an approximation of said solution. And, unlike Dave in *Ahornbäume*, Aaron does not perform another repair on this turn, particularly not a repair with a code-switch, suggesting his satisfaction with the solution he found in line 47; finally, the only pause, a micropause in line 49, following the word search, comes after an utterance from another speaker, and may therefore be due to the speaker briefly taking the floor, rather than to any uncertainty with regards to the appropriateness of the word search solution. Aaron therefore displays no uncertainty with regards to the

uncertainty of this word search solution, unlike he did in *Wie macht ihr das?* , in *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben*, and Dave did in *Ahornbäume*.

Whittington (2008) found that *also* also occurs in the word searches of German L1 speakers. While she argues that L1 speakers use *also* as "more or less a place holder, [holding] the current speaker's turn until the trouble source is repaired" (p. 56), upon further analysis of her examples, I argue that *also* serves to indicate uncertainty of a word search solution in L1 speakers as well as marking word search initiation. In the following example, taken from Whittington (2008), Markus (M) is discussing with his Oma (O) a brush fire happening in Florida, explaining that it is only the brush on the ground that is on fire and that the tress will likely survive.

Example 16 (Whittington, 2008, p. 42)

```
01    O:    (was sind) das denn für bäume?
02    M:    ouch das sind alles so pinien oder kiefern so wie
03          aussieht in den nachrichten
04          (.)
05          .h und dann ham die da (.) (und) florida ist auch
06 =>       (.) ganz im süden, dann ham die da also (.)
07 =>       palmen auch noch, und so alles tropisch.hh
```

In line 01 Oma makes a request for information regarding the types of trees involved in the brush fire. In line 02 Markus responds to her request, stating it is pine trees involved in the

brush fire; he, however, claims a lack of knowledge on this subject, saying in line 03 that the trees involved are the ones that can be seen in the news. After a pause in line 04, Markus continues in lines 05 and 06 to describe Florida's geographic location in terms of cardinal directions (*(und) florida is auch (.) ganz im süden*) before projecting the utterance of another item belonging to the list of trees he began in line 02 (*dann ham die da also (.)*).

Whittington (2008) argues here, with the utterance of *also*, Markus initiates a word search, the solution to which comes in line 07 (*palmen*). Unlike Aaron's word searches in *Wie macht ihr das?* and *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben* as well as Dave's word search in *Ahornbäume*, there are no other word search initiators in line 06 prior to Markus' utterance of *also*. However, Markus has already displayed a lack of knowledge on the topic of Floridian tree species in lines 02 and 03, which he redisplays in line 07, stating Florida has all tropical tree species while only naming one, *palmen*. His lack of knowledge on the topic of Floridian tree species suggests Markus may be uncertain as to whether palm trees are found in Florida and, therefore, uncertain as to the correctness of his word search solution.

This display of uncertainty towards a word search solution suggests that Aaron's utterance of *also* in *Wie macht ihr das?* and *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben*?, as well as Dave's utterance of the discourse particle in *Ahornbäume*, is target-like with respect to

projecting the utterance of an uncertain word search solution. However, as Whittington (2008) argues, L1 speakers use *also* to mark the initiation of a word search rather than the end of the search. In terms of my research questions, the L2 speakers' use of *also* in word searches is systematic, and there is consistency between L2 speakers in this use of the particle. However, L1 speakers mark the initiation and not the end of a word search with *also*, indicating that these L2 speakers' use of the particle to mark the end of word searches is not target-like.

4.4 Nonstraightforward Responses

Different kinds of questions make relevant different responses and response formats/types; for example, a yes/no question makes relevant either a *yes* or a *no* (or variations of these) from the asked co-interactant (Sidnell, 2010). Relevant response formats (that is, "type-conforming" responses) are not always what interactants produce, however (e.g. Raymond, 2003; Schegloff & Lerner, 2009 ; see also Stivers & Hayashi, 2010); in the case of nonstraightforward responses, not only can the response not conform to the format made relevant by the question that was asked, a response can also appear unrelated in content to the original question; when responding to a question with nonstraightforward response, interactants must therefore mark their nonstraightforward response as a response to their co-interactants, thereby instructing recipients to parse the turn for the ways in which it may be responsive (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009).

In the current data only Aaron and Dave utter *also* in nonstraightforward responses, Aaron twice and Dave three times. In nonstraightforward responses *also* appears both at turn beginnings and mid-turn, as well as at TCU beginnings and mid-TCU. The tables below summarize *also* in nontstraightforward responses by speaker and by turn & TCU positioning.

Table 7: Number of *also* utterances in nonstraightforward responses by speaker

Speaker	Number of also utterances
Aaron	2
Dave	3
Total	5

Table 8: Number of *also* utterances in nonstraightforward responses by turn and TCU positioning

Turn Positioning	Number of *also* utterance
Beginning	2
Mid	3
TCU Positioning	
Beginning	4
Mid	1
Total	5

Again looking at *Macht ihr das oft?*, Dave prefaces his response in line 32 and again in line 35 to Elena's request for information in lines 26 and 27 with *also*.

Example 17 (extended version of Example 5): Macht ihr das oft?

```
26  E:   MACHT ihr das wirklich in kanada oft?
27         also (ESST/ISST) ihr das oft zum [1frühstück?
28    D:                                    [1ä:hm::,
29    E:   oder SAGt]1 man das nur.
30    D:             ]1
31    B:   [((unintelligible))]
32  =>D:   [also::             ]
33    C:   <<quiet> nicht OFters>
34    D:   nicht oft=
35  =>     also
           *C and B shift gaze to centre of group
                                **C and B shift gaze to D
```

```
36    D:   *[wenn man (noch/doch)] **(keine/kenne/kann er) WAffeln=
37    C:    [(xxx XXX) tag.      ]
38    D:   =machen (will),
           C and B shift gaze back to plates
39    D:   [aber:-]
40    C:   [ja.   ]
41    E:   mm ((chuckles))
42         und es ist SO: anstrengend.
```

As discussed in section 4.3.1 (Self-repair: Reformulations/Unpackings), in line 26, Elena makes a request for information with regards to the frequency of occurrence of a particular activity (*MACHT ihr das wirklich in kanada oft?*); in line 27, she projects an unpacking of *MACHT* and *das* with an *also* (see Section 4.3.1), specifying the activity to which she is referring, namely eating a specific staple (in this case what they are consuming during the recording, waffles with maple syrup). In line 29, also in the form of a request, Elena does a face-saving manoeuvre, giving a reason for making the request in line 26 and 27, namely that this is shared stereotype of Canadians, the origin of which she is not aware/sure (*oder SAGt man das nur*). Elena's turn in lines 26, 27, and 29 make relevant from her Canadian co-interactants either a confirmation or a disconfirmation; a confirmation of the candidate understanding in line 29 would act as a disconfirmation of the request/understanding in lines 26 and 27. In line 28, Dave begins to provide a response to Elena's request for

information, uttering *ä:hm::* in partial overlap with Elena's turn; the use of this hesitation marker preliminarily projects the utterance of a nonstraightforward response. In overlap with Björn's unintelligible utterance in line 31 Dave utters ***also****::* (line 32); however, before Dave can continue his turn, Caitlin, in line 33 offers a response to Elena's request for information, *nicht OFters*, confirming the consumption of the staple for breakfast, however disconfirming suggested frequency of consumption, *oft*. In line 34, Dave partially repeats Caitlin's utterance in line 33 aligning himself with her partial confirmation (*nicht oft*); he then restarts in line 35 the turn he attempted in line 32, repeating ***also***, before beginning his response in line 36 (in partial overlap with Caitlin's partially unintelligible utterance in line 37) and continuing in line 38, possibly claiming a requisite desire to cook waffles before one can consume them. Caitlin and Dave's overlapping utterances in line 37 indicate possible competition for the floor between Caitlin and Dave. Dave's response is neither a confirmation nor a disconfirmation, and therefore not a response format made relevant by Elena's requests for information. And, while Dave first tries to provide a response in line 32, directly proceeding the utterance of the request for information, Caitlin's response in line 33 creates distance between Elena's request and Dave's response to said request. Finally, Dave's response, referring to a desire rather than a frequency, does not directly refer to the content of Elena's original request for information. Dave's response in lines 35, 36, and 38

is therefore not only not straightforward but, without being marked as a response, could potentially be interpreted as something other than responsive to lines 26-29. *Also* here therefore seems to marks Dave's turn in lines 35, 36, and 38 both as nonstraightforward and, secondarily, as a response.

At the end on line 38, Dave turn is, syntactically speaking, possibly complete; however, in line 39, Dave projects the utterance of another TCU with the conjunction *aber:*. Dave does not complete this second TCU because Elena takes the floor in line 41 (to tease Dave). Caitlin ends her turn started in line 37 with an overlapping *ja* in line 40; this second occurrence of overlap within the same turn further indicates competition for the floor between Caitlin and Dave.

Again looking at *Ein bestimmtes wetter*, we focus now on Dave's nonstraightforward, weather-based response to Elena's request for information regarding the geographic location of maple syrup production.

Example 18 (reprint of Example 11): Ein bestimmtes wetter

```
           E shifts gaze to D
31    E:   (gibt es) nur in QUEbec (.) ähm:-
32         ahornsyrup en werk[stätten in der gegend] oder.
33    D:                     [ahm:                 ]
           C shifts gaze to D
34    C:   ei (.) ein BISSchen in (.) in <<with canadian accent> ontario>.
```

```
                B shifts gaze to D
35    D:    <<quickly> ja ein bisschen in ontario>=
36          =ich [BRAUCH]=
37    A:         [(xxx) ]
38  =>D:    =also es GIBT ein (-)
39          bestimmtes WES (.) WETter [das             ] man dafür braucht
40    C:                              [<<nodding>hm_hm>]
41    A:    ((clears throat))
            E, C, and B shift gaze to D
42          [es IST  ] also ein bisschen
43    C:    [und auch]
44          die BÄUMe;  [find (sich) nur     ]
45    A:                [es (is/i) al (al/so)]_so es muss ein bisschen WÄRMer
                als a::h-
            C gets up and walks to counter
46    E:    im [WESTen]
47    A:       [null  ] grad-
48    E:    <<nods> hm_hm>
49    A:  (.) am MORgens und am=
50          =am abends dann ein bisschen RUNter.
```

In lines 31 and 32 Elena makes a request for information, asking whether maple syrup is only produced in Quebec; Elena's request, unlike wh-questions (i.e. questions starting with question words such as *what, where, when, who, how*, etc.), makes relevant either a

confirmation or disconfirmation. In line 33 Dave utters *ahm:*, indicating both his intention to take the floor and respond to Elena's request in lines 31 and 32, and that his response will be one not made relevant by Elena's request. In line 34, despite Dave indicating his intention to speak in line 33, Caitlin responds to Elena's request; Caitlin's response partially disconfirms Elena's request for information, specifically the *nur* in line 31. With her claim *ein BISSchen in (.) in ontario*, Caitlin confirms that maple syrup is predominantly produced in Quebec, however, not exclusively. Caitlin, being from Western Canada, seeks confirmation with her gaze shift couples her response with a gaze shift to Dave, who is both an Ontarian and the participant who brought the maple syrup being consumed at the breakfast and, as a result, is likely perceived by Caitlin as having epistemic authority on maple syrup production in Canada.

In line 35, with the affirmative response particle *ja* and a repeat of Caitlin's turn in line 34, Dave confirm Caitlin's claim (*ja ein bisschen in ontario*); in line 36 he possibly begins a new response (*ich BRAUCH*) to Elena's request in lines 31 and 32. In line 38 utters *also* and begins another new response to Elena's request, a response which he finishes in line 39, referring to a requisite weather for maple syrup production. Dave's response in lines 38 and 39 makes no reference to any part of Elena's request in lines 31 and 32; while she makes a request with regards to a geographic location of maple syrup production,

Dave's response in lines 38 and 39, containing neither a reference to a geographic location nor even a direct mention of maple syrup, is demonstrably nonstraightforward (as projected by his *ahm:* in line 33). Furthermore, there is a gap between Dave's response and the original request for information; Caitlin responds to the request first in line 34, Dave confirms the correctness of Caitlin's response in line 35, and he begins something in line 36, all before Dave's ultimate response in lines 38 and 39. The nonstraightforwardness of Dave's response coupled with the gap between it and Elena's request and this response put Dave's response in danger of not being perceived as a response. Dave, however, prefaces this response with *also*, thereby marking what proceeds it as a nonstraightforward response. Aaron's unpacking of Dave's turn in lines 42, 45, 47, 49, and 50 (discussed in section 4.3.1: Self-repair: Reformulations/Unpackings) indicate he understood Dave's response in line 38 and 39 as a reference to maple syrup production, its ideal weather conditions, and, therefore, as a response to Elena's request for information in lines 31 and 32.

The following example, *Woher kennst du sie?*, occurs after *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben*, in which Aaron's girlfriend was first mentioned in the interaction. In interaction occurring between these two examples there is some laughter as well as the mention of a region in Germany other than Swabian whose dialect is believed to be hard to

understand, 8 lines of interaction in total. This topic is expanded here. Here Aaron responds to a request for information from Elena as to how he met his girlfriend.

Example 19: Woher kennst du sie?

61 E: HAST [du] die kennen-=

62 B: [°h]

63 E: =also ist sie AUCH in eurem program (sinne/hier)?

64 od[er: woher kennst du]

65 =>A: [u:hm: NEE:. **also**=]

66 sie IST uh=

67 sie MACHT in=

68 im moment ähm se=

69 (.) ihr: pee aitch DEE, ((= PhD))

70 C: <<quietly><<English pronounciation> DOCtor>arbeiten.>

71 E: und (.) WOher kennst du sie?

*A shifts gave to D

72 jetz *[HIER aus ham]burg,

73 D: *[aus der schule-]

A shifts gaze back to center

74 A: uhm: ja. (-)

75 von der Uni. (-)

76 [in: KAnada.]

77 E: [(vielleicht) deutschland;]

78 achso in KAnada.

79 A: ja.

In line 61, Elena produces a request for information, which is cut off before completion; in line 63, she projects a reformulation of her request for information with *also* (see Section 4.3.1), offering a candidate understanding of where Aaron met his German girlfriend; in line 64, Elena then expands her turn to utter a third request for information, this time as a wh-question, asking how Aaron met his German girlfriend. In line 65, in overlap with Elena's request in line 64, A disconfirms Elena's candidate understanding in line 63, uttering first the hesitation marker *u:hm:* followed by the negative response particle *nee:*; similarly to Dave's *ä:hm::* in line 28 of Example 5, Aaron's *u:hm* already preliminarily marks the following disconfirmation as being nonstraightforward, or at least dispreferred. Following the *NEE:* in line 63, Aaron utters *also*. In line 66, he elaborates on his disconfirmation, beginning to describe the academic program his girlfriend is enrolled in (*sie IST uh*); he then reformulates his utterance, this time with no projecting *also*, initiates a repair on *in*, replacing it with *im*. In line 68, Aaron initiates another word search in the same line with *ähm* , begins uttering the masculine possessive pronoun *sein* (*se*), which he then repairs in line 69 to the feminine form *ihr:*, before naming his girlfriend's academic program (*pee aitch DEE, ((= PhD))*), thus completing the word search as well as his response to Elena's request for information in line 63. Again, this response is

nonstraightforward; until the utterance of his girlfriend's academic program in line 69, the relevance of this response to Elena's request for information in line 63 is not explicit. However, in line 65, Aaron does disconfirm Elena's request for information in line 63 with the negative response particle *NEE:*, marking his subsequent elaboration on his response in lines 66 to 69 as also being responsive. *Also* can therefore here not be marking Aaron's elaboration as a response, since the marking has already been completed by *NEE:*; also's function appears to, therefore, be primarily to mark a response as nonstraightforward and, secondarily, in cases such as Dave's response in *Macht ihr das oft?* and in *Ein bestimmtes wetter* - where there were was both a gap between the response and its request for information *and* a lack of response particle in the response - to mark a turn as responsive when such a marking would be otherwise absent.

In line 70, Caitlin performs a repair on Aaron's response, uttering a potential German equivalent to the English term *PhD* (*DOCtorarbeiten*). In line 71 Elena reissues her request for information in line 64, offering, in line 72, another candidate understanding of the geographical location in which Aaron met his girlfriend, namely that they met in the city in which Aaron is currently a student. Dave, in overlap with Elena in line 72, responds to Elena's request for information, not confirming or disconfirming Elena's candidate understanding in line 72, but rather responding to her request for information from line 71.

In line 74, Aaron then confirms Dave's utterance in line 73. In this turn, Aaron, however, also initiates a repair on Dave's utterance in line 73. The German *Schule*, while it translates to the English *school*, does not typically refer to post-secondary institutions; since Aaron met his girlfriend during his graduate studies, *Universität*, or its short form *Uni* would be more appropriate. Therefore, Dave's utterance in line 73 contains a repairable trouble source (*schule*); Aaron initiates a repair on this trouble source in line 74 (*uhm: ja*), uttering the repair solution in line 75 (*von der Uni*). In line 76, Aaron also disconfirms Elena's candidate understanding in line 72, by specifying the geographical location of the university at which he met his girlfriend (*in: KAnada*). In line 77, in overlap with Aaron's correction Elena offers another candidate understanding of where Aaron met his girlfriend; however, in line 78, she utters the epistemic change-of-state token *achso*, and then repeating *KAnada*, indicating she has received and understood the answer to her request for information in line 64 (Golato & Betz, 2008).

In the previous three examples L2 speakers Dave and Aaron use *also* to mark responses to requests for information as nonstraightforward, and as responsive when there is no other marking of responsiveness, such as a response particle. In *Macht ihr das oft*?, Dave partially disconfirms Elena's request for information with a nonstraightforward response marked by a prefacing *also*, claiming a link between the desire to cook waffles and

the frequency of their consumption; In *Ein bestimmtes wetter*, Dave, after gap proceeding the original request for information, responds to Elena's request for information regarding the geographic location of maple syrup production with a reference to a requisite weather for maple syrup production. In *Woher kennst du sie*? Aaron expands on a disconfirmation of Elena's request for information with a prefacing *also*, disconfirming his girlfriend's enrolment in the Canadian interactant's academic program. All three of these responses are demonstrably nonstraightforward and, in the case of Dave's responses in *Macht ihr das oft?* and *Ein bestimmtes Wetter*, the responses are not explicitly responsive; the function of *also* in these situations appears to be therefore primarily to draw co-interactants' attention to the ways in which the response is nonstraightforward and, when required, to mark a response as a response in the first place.

While no previous research on *also* observed the particle's function of marking responses as nonstraightforward, Schegloff and Lerner (2009) studied the English particle *well* in nonstraightforward responses to wh-questions. In the following example, taken from Schegloff and Lerner (2009), Mark (Mar) and Kim are discussing how to set up the rooms in their house in preparation for the arrival of their new baby, here specifically regarding where the television will be located. In line 12 Kim produces a *well*-prefaced response to wh-question from Mark.

Example 20: Ravioli Dinner (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009, p. 100)

```
01   Mar:   Eventually the tv'll be in the living room(,)/(.)
02          (2.0)
03   Kim:   I(h) don't th(h)ink s(h)o(h) (.) ((sniff:))
04          (0.2)
05   Kim:   uhhh=(h)It's (h)not gonna g(h)o in(h) th(h)uh
06          l(h)iv(h)ing r(h)oom(h).
07   Kim:   .hhh
08          (0.4)
09   Kim:    Honey I don't want it in the living room.
10   Mar: -> How many times you sat in the living room: since we'(ve)
11           moved in here.
12  Kim:->> Well:, I'll go in there tonight?
```

In line 01 Mark makes a prediction as to the television being in their living room; after a pause in line 02, Kim displays disagreement with Mark (*I don't think so*); in lines 05 and 06 she restates her disagreement, making the opposite prediction to Mark (*It's not gonna go in thuh living room*). After another pause line 08, Kim downgrades her turn in line 02 and her turn in lines 05 and 06, now expressing a desire for the television to remain outside of the living room (*Honey I don't want it in the living room.*). In lines 10 and 11 Mark poses a wh-question, designed to challenge Kim's basis/motivation for the rejection of Mark's suggestion in line 01; however, instead of answering the question, Kim, in line 12, responds

with a *well*-prefaced promise to use the room that evening. This response, making no reference to a previous frequency of use and rather to a promised future use, is nonstraightforward, similarly to the *also*-prefaced nonstraightforward responses in *Macht ihr das oft?, Ein bestimmtes wetter,* and *Woher kennst du sie?*. This finding suggests that either: (1) the English *well* and the German *also* are functional equivalents in nonstraightforward answers, and/or, (2) the L2 speakers are using *also* in German as a functional equivalent to *well* in nonstraightforward responses. These two possibilities are not mutually exclusive; however, while there is research on the functional equivalency between *well* and German particles (see Barske & Betz, 2013), making (1) (and therefore (2)) a real possibility, more research is necessary to determine whether *also* in the functional equivalent of *well* in German or whether this is a pattern of use specific to the L2 speakers in the current data.

However, it is important to note that, while in my examples the nonstraightforward answers were all in response to requests that made relevant a confirmation or disconfirmation, Schegloff and Lerner (2009) studied *well* purely in response to wh-questions, which do not make relevant confirmation or disconfirmation. Research on nonstraightforward answers to confirmables in English interaction (in this case, specifically Canadian English interactions) may shed light onto the possible translation

practices at play in L2 speakers; furthermore, the absence of *also*-marked nonstraightforward answers from L1 speakers in my data is not an indication that this is a non-target-like practice; the L1 speakers may not have been asked a question to which they could only provide a nonstraightforward response. Research into the nonstraightforward responses of German L1 speakers would uncover if *also* plays a role in nonstraightforward responses and if the L2 speakers' use of *also* in nonstraightforward responses is, in fact, non-target-like.

Returning again to my research questions, the L2 speakers' use of the particle *also* in the projection of nonstraightforward responses is systematic, and, while the projecting of nonstraightforward responses with *also* has not been observed in German L1 speakers, this use of *also* is not definitively non-target-like. However, when we consider the similarities between the L2 speakers' use of *also* to project nonstraightforward responses with the English *well* in the same function, it appears possible that the L2 speakers' use of *also* in nonstraightforward responses may be influenced by a functionally similar particle existing in their L1, English, regardless of whether this use of *also* is target-like or not.

4.5 Multi-Unit Turns

The fourth use of *also* that appears in my data the projecting a multi-unit turn. This kind of *also* appears 9 times within the data; as with *also* in reformulations and unpackings, both

by the L1 speakers (Björn and Elena) and two L2 speakers (Aaron and Dave) utter this kind of *also*. This *also* also appears once at a turn beginning and 3 times mid-turn, however it only occurs at TCU beginnings. I summarize the findings on speaker use in the table below.

Table 9: Number of *also* utterances in multi-unit turns by speaker

Speaker	Number of also utterances
L2s	
Aaron	1
Dave	3
L1s	
Elena	1
Björn	2
Total	7

In the following example, Elena summarizes what she has learned about Aaron's girlfriend during the interaction. This summary spans from lines 89 to 91, and is prefaced with *also*.

Example 21: Sie ist deutsch

```
80    E:   sind ihre eltern denn DEUTSCH,
81         wenn ihre ELtern in schwaben wohnen.
82    A:   <<cupping right ear with right hand> entschuld,>
83    E:   (.) ähm: sind ihre ELtern [denn    ] deutsch,
84    C:                             [(ja/yes]]
85         yes
86    A:   <<nodding> oh jop>
87    C:   sie IST deutsch.
88    A:   [(sie IST deutsch ja ja ja)].
89  =>E:   also SIE ist deutsch-
90         war EIN jahr in kanada; (.)
91         und kommt jetzt GLEICH [wieder zu    ]
```

92 A: <<looking away> [ein oder zwei] oder DREI jahren>

In line 80, Elena makes a request for information, asking if Aaron's girlfriend's parents are German; in line 81, Elena provides a reason for the request (*wenn ihre ELtern in schwaben wohnen.*), referring to Aaron's previous statement that his girlfriend's parents live in Swabia. In line 82 Aaron indicates he heard Elena's turn in line 80 and 81, but did not understand what she uttered; he cups his ear, signalling difficulty hearing, and requests a repeat from Elena with *entschuld*. In line 83, Elena repeats her request for information (*ähm: sind ihre ELtern denn deutsch,*), which Caitlin confirms in line 84; she repeats this confirmation in line 85, both times uttering an affirmative response particle. Aaron, in line 86, confirms Caitlin's confirmation in lines 84 and 85, uttering the epistemic change-of-state response particle *oh*, indicating understanding of Elena's request for information (Heritage, A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement, 1984)[19].

In line 87 Caitlin offers the understanding that Aaron's girlfriend is German, which Aaron confirms with a repeat (*sie IST deutsch*) and then three utterances of *ja* in line 88. In line 89, Elena begins a multi-part summary of what she has learned about Aaron's German

[19] While *oh* in German marks an emotional change-of-state (Golato, 2012), in contrast to *ach*, which marks an epistemic change of state (Golato & Betz, 2008; Golato, 2010), it appears here that Aaron is using an English *oh*, marking an epistemic change-of-state from one of not understanding to one of understanding (Heritage, 1984).

girlfriend in the form of an extended candidate understanding, prefaced with *also*; in line 89, she repeats Caitlin's turn in line 87 and Aaron's in line 88 (*SIE ist deutsch-*), then refers to a period of time she spent in Canada in line 90 (*war EIN jahr in kanada; (.)*), and then begins to formulate that the girlfriend is returning soon to Germany (*und kommt jetzt GLEICH wieder zu*) in line 91. Aaron, in line 92, in overlap with Elena in line 91, disconfirms Elena's turn in line 90, stating that his girlfriend was in Canada for a longer period of time than Elena understood (*ein oder zwei oder DREI jahren*). Elena here prefaced her multi-part summary with *also*, projecting that her turn will consist of several parts, namely three candidate understandings: the first one of Aaron's girlfriend's German nationality in line 89, the second of how long Aaron's German girlfriend lived in Canada in line 90, and the third of the imminent return to Germany.

In *Wir könnten euch mal dialekt beibringen*, preceding Aaron's introducing the topic of his Swabian girlfriend into the interaction in *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben*, there is another instance of an L1 speaker using *also* to project the utterance of a multi-unit turn, this time as part of a discussion of German dialects.

Example 22: Wir könnten euch mal dialekt beibringen

```
93    E:   (xxx xxx) wir könnten euch mal diaLEKT beibrin[gen].
94    B:                                                [ja ].
95    E:   [wir ] könn(t)ens=
```

96 =>B: [**also**]

97 E: =also ich KANN's nicht.

98 also ich KANN unsern dialekt nicht.

99 B: du kannst NICHT?

100 E: [nee]-

101 =>B: [**also**] DA wo ich herkomme-

102 nennt man marmeLAde

103 (nämlich) (-)

104 aeh. (-)

105 gsSÄLZ-

106 E: gsälz?

107 All: ((laughter))

108 D: gSÄLZ?

109 E: ja das KENN ich auch;

In line 93 Elena suggests she and Björn teach the Canadians some dialectal German; Björn aligns himself with Elena in line 94 with a affirmative response particle (*ja*). E begins a new TCU in line 95 (*wir könn(t)ens*), but, in line 97, abandons the turn mid-TCU to claim a lack of dialectal German (*also ich KANN's nicht*); in line 98 she unpacks *'s* (*es*) from line 97, disambiguating the pronoun with *unsern dialekt*, indicating her lack of knowledge of the German dialect that she may be expected to be competent in. In line 96, in overlap with

Elena's utterance in line 95, Björn indicates his preparedness/readiness to respond to the suggestion in line 93 with *also*.

In line 99, Björn puts the turn he began in line 96 on hold, requesting confirmation of Elena's utterance in line 98 with a modified repeat of her utterance, Elena, in line 100, confirms that she cannot speak the dialect of where she is from, uttering the negative response particle *nee*. In line 101, Björn restarts the turn he began in line 96, repeating *also* before beginning an instructional sequence in response to Elena's suggestion in line 93, projecting a telling and/or the provision of an example from his own dialect (*DA wo ich herkomme*). In line 102 he provides the Standard German version of the lexical item that he will translate into his dialect (*nennt man marmeLAde*), and then utters *äh* in line 104. This äh, unlike previous examples in which *äh* marked the beginning of a word search, here more likely acts to prepare Björn's vocal organs for an utterance in another variety of Germany, which he has yet to do in the interaction; the word search scenario is unlikely because of his utterance of *marmeLAde* in line 102, indicating he has already chosen the word he will translate into his dialect, suggesting he already had access to the dialectal translation of his chosen lexical item in line 102, prior to the *aeh.* in line 104. In line 105, utters the dialect word/item he projected in lines 101 and 102 (*gsSÄLZ*)., ending Björn's instructional sequence.

In line 106 Elena performs a repair on Björn's utterance in line 105, repeating *gsälz* to confirm what she heard; after the laughter in line 107, in line 108 D repeats Elena's repair in line 106, also repeating the dialectal word (*gSÄLZ*). In line 109 Elena confirms the existence of the dialectal term Björn uttered in line 105, thus claiming epistemic priority to said term (*ja das KENN ich auch*).

Björn's instructional sequence, containing a reference to the area from which he comes in line 101 (*DA wo ich herkomme-*), a projection of the dialect he will be teaching the other co-interactants in line 102 (*nennt man marmeLAde*), a vocal organ preparation in line 104 (*aeh.*), and finally the projected dialectal item in line 105 (*gSÄLZ*), contains several units; again, a multi-unit turn is prefaced by *also* in an L1 speaker's talk, Elena's multi-unit summary in *Sie ist deutsch*, and Björn's teaching sequence in *Wir könnten euch mal dialekt beibringen*, indicating there is a practice of projecting multi-unit turns with *also* in German. Again looking at *Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben*, in which Aaron's girlfriend is introduced for the first time in the interaction, we now focus on the Aaron's multi-unit turn in lines 48, 52, 53, 54, and 55, prefaced with *also* in line 48.

Example 23 (reprint of Example 14): Meine freundin sie kommt aus schwaben

```
46  A:    (das ist en/zem THEmen)
47         diaLEKten
48  =>     also m:eine freundin sie kommt aus u::h SCHWAben?
```

```
49          (.)
50    All:  ((laughter, approx. 0.7 sec))
51          (1.0)
52    A:    und u::h am OST=
53          u:h also am OSter: kennte=
54          kenne ICH u:hm;
55          den eltern: (-) zum ERSten mal lernen.
56    E:    OH je.
57    A:    un:d_uh
58          ((laughter))
59    A:    (xxx) u::h=
60    E:    du wirst NICHTs verstehen;
```

In lines 46 and 47 Aaron connects his following sequence to the topic of dialects introduced in the previous example *Wir könnten euch mal dialekt beibringen* (*(das ist en/zem THEmen) diaLEKten*). In line 48 Aaron introduces the topic of his girlfriend, referring to her home region in Germany (***also*** *m:eine freundin sie kommt aus u::h SCHWAben?*); although Aaron's utterance in line 48 is a complete TCU and, therefore, the end of line 48 marks his turn as syntactically possibly complete, the upward inflection on the TCU's final word *SCHWAben?* indicates Aaron's turn is not yet done. After a micro pause in line 49, laughter in line 50, and a pause in line 51, Aaron continues by describing a future setting in which he will meet his girlfriend's parents. In lines 52, 53, 54, and 55, Aaron refers to the first planned meeting

between him and his girlfriend's parents (*und u::h am OST= u:h also am OSter: kennte= kenne ICH u:hm; den eltern: (-) zum ERSten mal lernen.*; see Section 4.3.2 for a discussion of Aaron's word search in lines 52 and 53). Aaron's reference to the first meeting planned meeting between him and his girlfriend's parents coupled with the reference to the dialect topic in lines 46 and 47 seems to project a telling about his girlfriend and the dialect her family speaks (see Jefferson 1978 for a more in-depth discussion of storytelling in interaction).

In line 56, Elena indicates that Aaron will experience some sort of difficulty during this meeting (*OH je.*) likely referring to the difficulty of understanding the Swabian dialect, since dialect was the previous topic of conversation and it is the frame that Aaron set up for his telling in lines 46 and 47. In line 57 Aaron projects further talk with *un:d_uh*; before Aaron can utter this the projected further talk, there is laughter in line 58. Aaron makes another utterance in line 59, here unintelligible (*(xxx) u::h=*); and in line 60, Elena makes a reference to the dialect topic, stating Aaron will not understand anything during this first meeting, thus making explicit her understanding of how Aarons telling so far is connected to the topic of dialects.

Aaron's account in these lines, the introduction in line 48, the reference to the first planned meeting in lines 52 to 55, and the projection of further talk in 57, are again a multi-

unit turn, similar to Elena's multi-unit summary in lines 89 to 91 in *Sie ist deutsch*, and to BJörn's teaching sequence in lines 101 to 105 in *Wir könnten euch mal dialekt beibringen*. Aaron is the only L2 speaker to use *also* to project multi-unit turns; other L2 speakers in the interaction may not have access to this use of *also* or they may simply not have engaged in as much extended talk (storytellings, explanations) as Aaron.

Here again we have a systematic use of the particle *also* on the part of an L2 speaker (Aaron), namely in the projection of a multi-unit turn. Furthermore, L1 speakers use *also* to project multi-unit turns as well, suggesting Aaron's use of *also* here is target-like. He is, however, the only L2 speaker in my data to use *also* in this manner, suggesting the other L2 speakers do not use *also* in this manner; however, it is also possible that the other L2 speakers simply did not produce any multi-unit turns and, therefore, did not project the utterance of any multi-unit turn with *also*.

4.6 Summary of Analysis

This chapter analyzed the use of the discourse particle *also* in different sequential contexts: projecting reformulations/unpackings, projecting an approximate (insufficient, inappropriate, uncertain) word search solution, projecting a nonstraightforward response, and projecting a multi-unit turn. Returning to my research questions from section 3.1, as I demonstrated, L2 speakers use *also* to accomplish all four of these communicative actions

systematically; in the case of reformulations/unpackings, and multi-unit turns, the L2 speakers' use of *also* is similar to that of German L1 speakers. In the case of word searches and nonstraightforward responses, the L2 speakers (that is, the interactional practice they instantiate) differ from the L1 speaker use: In word searches, L1 speakers use *also* to mark the initiation of a word search, to solution to which will be an approximation, while the L2 speakers use *also* only project the approximate word search solution and do not mark the search initiation; and in nonstraightforward responses, the L2 speakers' *also*s appear similar in function to that of the English discourse particle *well* in marking nonstraightforward responses to wh-questions, and it is unclear whether L1 speakers use *also* in this capacity as well (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). In the following Discussion Section I contextualize my findings within the fields of Conversation Analysis, Second Language Acquisition, and Study Abroad.

5 Discussion

At the end of my section of conversation analysis (section 3.1) I presented three research questions that motivated the current project, asking whether L2 speakers use particles in the L2, whether that use is systematic, and whether the L2 speakers' particle use matches that of L1 speakers or other L2 speakers. Guided by these, questions, I analyzed the use of the German particle *also* in an everyday interaction between L1 speakers and Canadian L2 speakers German. I found that L2 speakers use the German particle *also* to perform 4 different actions, namely: to project the utterance of an unpacking or reformulation of a previous utterance, to project the utterance of an uncertain word search solution, to project a nonstraightforward response, and to project a multi-unit turn. These four uses of *also* indicate that L2 speakers both use particles in the L2, and that their particle use is systematic. The L2 speakers' particle use does not always necessarily match that of the L1 speakers.

In my data, both an L1 speaker, Elena, and two L2 speakers, Dave an Aaron, project the utterance of a reformulation or unpacking with *also*, demonstrating that L2 speakers' particle use can match that of their L1 counterparts. Similarly, both of the L1 speakers

(Elena and Björn), and the L2 speaker Aaron use *also* to project multi-unit turns, again indicating consistency between the L2 and L1 speakers' use of the particle *also*.

In the case of projecting uncertain word search solutions, however, it appears that Dave and Aaron's use of *also* only partially matches that of L1 speakers. As Whittington (2008) demonstrated, L1 speakers do use *also* in word searches, and my analysis of her data indicate that L1 speakers use *also* to project the utterance of an uncertain word search solution; however, the L2 speakers in my data mark the end of a word search with *also*, while Whittington (2008) found that L1 speakers mark the initiation of word searches with *also.* The L2 speakers' use of *also* in word searches is therefore systematic, however it does not match that of L1 speakers. Finally, the L2 speakers' use of *also* in projecting nonstraightforward answers has neither been found in my data, nor in previous research on L1 speakers' use of *also*; while this alone does indicate that L1 speakers do not project nonstraightforward responses with *also*, it is possible that the L2 speakers are using the particle in the same manner in German as they do *well* in their L1, English (see Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). L2 speakers' particle use in the L2 may therefore be influenced by their L1.

Conversation analysis for second language acquisition, or CA-SLA (Pekarek Doehler, 2013), uses CA to study language learners' interactions in the L2 to better understand the language learning process. CA-SLA views "language learning as a situated social practice"

(Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013, p. 2), with a focus on activities learners complete, "such as telling a story, negotiating an understanding, solving a task, and so forth" (p. 2) and how learners' patterns of interaction serve to complete these actions, rather than on the correctness of the learners' L2 use. CA, when used to study both L1 and L2 speakers, cannot uncover "what happens in the brain of the [speaker]" (Pekarek Doehler, 2013, p. 2); rather, CA allows researchers to uncover how language learning is "observably shaped within the moment-by-moment unfolding of everyday communicative practices and the social agents' local interpretive processes" (Pekarek Doehler, 2013, p. 2).

For example, in their study of corrections in language learning classrooms, Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013) found that learners' do not orient themselves to all kinds of teacher-initiated corrections equally: Recasts, for example, in which the teacher repeats a student's previous utterance, replacing non-target like talk with target-like talk, are often not oriented to as corrections. For example, in the following excerpt from a French-language classroom in German-speaking Switzerland, the student Fabio (Fab) is describing to the class, in French, how an acquaintance of his in Geneva was deported.

Example 24: CODI DK-B-4 (Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013, pp. 339-40)

01 Fab: ou:ais on a eu (0.3) un s: un cas comme ça (0.2)
yeah we AUX had a a case like that
02 à: genève.
in geneva
03 (1.4)
04 Fab: je crois.
i believe
05 Fab: et: (0.4) ouais on: lui a expulsé
and yeah we him.DAT AUX deported
and yeah we expelled him ((dative))
06 (1.0)
07 =>T: on l' a expulsé
we him.ACC AUX expelled
we expelled him ((accusative))
08 ouais.=
yeah
09 =>Fab: =ouais, (0.7) je crois.
yeah i believe
10 (2.1)
11 T: alors euh: on va demander à mélissa euh (0.4)
so we will ask PREP melissa

In line 01 Fabio begins the account, referring to the case of deportation about which he will be speaking; in line 02 he adds a geographic location of from where the deportation occurred, Geneva. In line 04, Fabio indicates he may be misremembering this account. He continues in line 05, saying that the person to which he referred in line 01 was expelled; however, Fabio here uses the dative pronoun *lui* instead of the accusative pronoun. The teacher, in line 07, corrects this in a recast, stressing the accusative pronoun/auxiliary verb amalgamation (*on l'a expulsé*), which Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013) argue indicates

that this utterance from the teacher in line 07 is intended to be a correction on the part of the teacher (see Koshik, 2005; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Heritage & Raymond, 2005). However, in line 09, in which Fabio offers a confirmation, instead of taking up the correction (for example through a modified repeat of his utterance in line 05; in line 09, Fabio is indicating he interpreted the teacher's turn in lines 07 and 08 as a candidate understanding of Fabio's utterance in line 05 rather than a correction of this utterance.

Lauzon and Pekarek Doehler (2013) found that learners often interpret embedded recasts, like the one in line 07 of the example above, as doing something other than a correction. They conclude that, while embedded recasts allow teachers to correct a student's previous talk without interrupting the flow of interaction, their function as a correction becomes of secondary importance; learners appear to have difficulty recognizing that recasts are corrective, which indicates recasts may not be effective at orienting learners' to the recasts as a pedagogical practice in which their utterance was non-target-like, i.e. it is not an effective form of correction (Lauzon & Pekarek Doehler, 2013). Lauzon and Pekarek (2013) conclude that, when using the L2, learners' attentions "shift rapidly between dealing with linguistic form, with informational content, with the organization of mutual actions, and with multiple and complex intersections between these" (p. 347); learners orienting to recasts as corrections may have more to do with what their

attention is preoccupied with when the recast is offered, i.e. if a learner is focused on ensuring that the content of his turn is understood by his co-interactants rather than the presentation of that content being target-like, then they are likely to orient to a recast as a candidate understanding rather than a correction. This and research like it (see also Seedhouse, 1997; Seedhouse, 2004) improve our understanding of the inner workings of classroom language learning, having potential pedagogical implications for language teaching.

While CA-SLA has deepened our understanding of language learning in the classroom, it has remained largely exterior to the study abroad context. While the current project's focus is L2 speakers' interactions in the L2 rather than their acquisition of the L2, it serves to demonstrate that CA can be applied to analyzing L2 speakers' interactions. In the study abroad context, using CA and a series of recordings made throughout the study abroad experience, researchers can track how learners' interactions change during their study abroad experience, for example their performance of actions in interaction, the influence of their L1 on their L2 interactions, and, like in the current study, their use of particles in the L2.

Previous research suggests describing L2 speakers' particle use as *target* or *non-target-like*, or referring to the speakers themselves as language *learners* may not do justice

to L2 speakers or to what is at play in interaction. Here I discuss SLA's conception of the language learner, namely as being a deficient speaker of the L2, and its effect on how L2 speakers' interactions are understood; I then compare this conception of the language learner with Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher's 2006 study examining language learners' non-target-like particle use in the L2 as evidence for a mixed code rather than a language deficiency. The goal here is to provide a clearer picture of what it means to be an L2 speaker in order to better conceptualize both my and previous findings on L2 speaker interactions.

In SLA, when language learners are discussed, "the learner is viewed as a defective communicator", with a focus on the learners' "*linguistic deficiencies* and *communicative problems*" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 760) rather then on their communicative successes. Furthermore, the language learner is viewed as a subordinate to the L1 speaker, and comparisons such as language learner/native speaker, non-native/native speaker, and L2/L1 speaker "imply homogeneity throughout each group, and clear-cut distinctions between them" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 764). This view of learners is clear in research on learners' communication strategies, or "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Færch

& Kasper, 1983, p. 36)[20]. Let us consider code-switching from the L2 to the L1, which is often interpreted in SLA research as an indicator of language deficiency in L2 speakers (Firth & Wagner, 2007). However, in interactions between L2 and L1 speakers, an L1 speaker does not typically orient to the L2 speaker's code-switch as a problem in communication; rather, L1 speakers orient to a code-switch as a meaningful utterance, focusing "on the message content rather than on the marked form of [the L2 speaker]'s speech" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 762). In this manner, the L2 speaker's status as an L2 speaker is a meaning-making resource in interaction rather than a source for communicative trouble, that is, the L2 speaker status actually fosters rather than hinders meaningful communication (Firth & Wagner, 2007). In the same manner, examples of L2 speakers' "non-target-like" particle use, e.g. of *also* in the marking of the end of a word search and in the projection of a nonstraightforward response, should not be interpreted as being communicatively deficient, for this prevents analyses for the ways in which these uses may be communicatively successful.

Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2006), in their study of advanced learners of German's particle use in an upper year seminar course on applied linguistics at a Canadian university

[20] It is important to note that this conception of communication strategies is similar to that of repair in CA; see section 4.3 on repair.

taught in German[21], treated instances of the L1 (here, English) influencing L2 interactions as an indicator of a mixed code rather than one of communicative deficiency. Studying both English and German particles that the learners used during the course, Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2006) found that several of the German particles had functional equivalents in English; however, although there were functional equivalents in each of the languages, meaning the learners could potentially use the English particles in German (instead of the German particles), and *vice versa*, the learners' particle choice was overwhelmingly linked to the language of the utterance in which the particles occurred, i.e., if a learner is speaking German, they are more likely to use the German particle rather than its English equivalent, and *vice versa.* However, this code-dependency of particle choice did not apply for the functional equivalent particles *so* and *also*, from English and German, respectively (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006).

Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2006) found that, for the learners, "the functions where 'also' would be used in German native speaker monolingual discourse are reserved for 'so' in almost every case, even when the surrounding discourse is in German" (p. 103).

[21] While the learners were encouraged to communicate in German, they had the choice between using English and German in in-class discussions; the course syllabus stated this explicitly. However, during presentations, the learners were instructed to use German exclusively (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006).

This use of an English particle in German talk on the part of the learners may be evidence for the learners mixing German and English into a "mixed code" (Auer, 1998), i.e. that instead of the learners treating German and English as two separate linguistic codes, they are combining the two into a single code (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006). This mixed code suggests that bilingual speakers, such as the students in Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2006)'s study as well as the Canadians in my own, are not simply potential monolingual speakers of two languages, "who keep both languages distinct, and never borrow elements from one language into the other" (p. 106); the *so-also* equivalency Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2006) found, as well as the potential *also-well* equivalency in nonstraightforward answers I observed in my data, are practices of bilingualism, or even multilingualism (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006). More research on these practices would have implications for our understanding of language learners' interactions in the L2, as well as implications on second language teaching (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006).

Returning once more to the research questions posed earlier, I showed that L2 speakers do use particles in informal, everyday interactions in German. Furthermore, their use of these particles is systematic and, in reformulations/unpackings and multi-unit turns, matches L1 speakers' particle use; in contrast, the L2 speakers' use of *also* in word searches and in nonstraightforward responses appears to be non-target-like.

In the current study, I only looked at L2 speakers' use of one discourse particle, *also*; while my analysis did provide several insights into how L2 speakers perform actions in interaction, it only provides a small glimpse into the nature of their everyday interactions in the L2. Studying how L2 speakers use other particles in the L2, especially response and modal particles, as well as L2 speakers' actions and meaning creations without particles will give more insight into interacting in an L2.

The current study is not longitudinal, i.e. I transcribed and analyzed L2 speakers' interactions with L1 speakers at one point in time; I therefore only studied L2 speakers' particle use, and not any change in their particle use as a product of studying abroad. A comparison between the acquisition of particles and other pragmatic features in a study abroad context versus as a result of instruction is relevant to the understanding of the language acquisition process. Betz and Huth (2014) argue that elements of the target language's interaction, such as opening and closing conversations, negotiating epistemic asymmetries, and the functions of "little words" (such as *also*) must be taught explicitly in order to raise awareness in a classroom setting (and thus facilitate acquisition); Betz and Huth (2014) further emphasize the importance of including pragmatic elements of the L2 in foreign language teaching, arguing that "learning [interactional elements of the target language] opens up opportunities for learners to fully participate in social interaction with

native speakers in culturally appropriate ways" (p. 140). During study abroad language L2 speakers do, however, acquire interactional elements of the target language without explicit instruction (see, Kinginger 2013 for a collection of works on language acquisition during study abroad); however, there is little study abroad research on language acquisition using interactional data (see Brown, 2013; Behrent, 2007). Using CA, we can analyze and compare L2 speakers' interactions at different points in time during the sojourn, tracking the ways in which L2 speakers' use of pragmatic elements in interaction changes as a result of study abroad.

Study abroad, however, is neither a guarantee that learners will acquire these pragmatic elements (see Fernandez, 2013), nor that they will use them in target language interactions (see Brown, 2013), and these individual differences have been attributed to differences in contact with the target language and culture during a sojourn (Brown, 2013; Fernandez, 2013). Language acquisition during study abroad must be understood within the larger, complex frame of the learners' study abroad experiences (see section 2.1 on study abroad research). In order to truly understand the study abroad experience and its potential role in the acquisition of target language interactional elements, research combining and comparing interactional data with data on the learners' study abroad

experience (e.g. through a series of interviews before, during, and after the sojourn; periodic diary entries; etc.) is necessary.

6 Conclusion

In my study of L2 speakers of German's use of the discourse particle *also* in an everyday L2 interaction, I show that L2 speakers both use particles in interaction, and that their particle use is systematic. In the case of projecting a reformulation/unpacking and a multi-unit turn, the L2 speakers' use of *also* appears to match that of their L1 speaker counterparts; this is seen in my own data and, in the case of unpackings, in previous research on German L1 speakers' use of the particle *also* (see Whittington, 2008). However, the L2 speakers' use of *also* in marking the end of a word search rather than its initiation is demonstrably non-target-like. And in the projection of nonstraightforward responses, the L2 speakers use of *also* may by influenced by the particle *well* in their L1, English, which projects a nonstraightforward response in answers to wh-questions (Schegloff & Lerner, 2009). The influence of the L1 on particle use in the L2 has already been observed in classroom interaction (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2006).

While this study does not attempt to make claims about how the L2 speakers acquired these particles, it contributes to the already existing body of research on L2 speakers' interactions; this research has, however, been mostly limited to the language learning classroom context and, while classroom interactions more fluid and diverse than

often assumed (Seedhouse, 1997), is still an interactional context motivated primarily by teaching and learning (Huth, 2011). Studying interactions in the L2 in several interactional contexts will provide a more complete picture as to how L2 speakers co-create meaning, negotiate problems of understanding, foster interpersonal relationships, use little words such as particles, etc., in L2 interactions.

Study abroad participants engage in a variety of everyday interaction, and these interactions can be a fruitful source of data. However, language acquisition during study abroad, much like particles, must be understood within a larger context. Learning acquisition is only one component of study abroad, and CA can be used to provide new insights in this part of the experience; but learners' encounters with the host culture, with the target language, and how learners make sense of their study abroad experience all influence study abroad language acquisition.

7 Works Cited

Alm, M. (2004). The Contribution of Sentence Position: The Word "also" in Spoken German. Unpublished manuscript.

Auer, P. (1998). Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Codeswitching in conversation* (pp. 1-24). New York, London: Routledge.

Auer, P. (1996). The Pre-Front Field in Spoken German and its Relevance as a Grammaticalization Position. *Pragmatics , 6* (3), 295-322.

Auer, P., & Uhmann, S. (1982). Aspekte der konversationellen Organisation von Bewertungen. *Deutsche Sprache , 1*, 1-32.

Barske, T., & Betz, E. (2013). Responding to v. answering a question: The turn-initial marker ja in German interaction. *Conference of the International Insitute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis.* Waterloo, ON.

Behrent, S. (2007). *La communication interalloglotte: Communiquer dans la langue cible commune.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Betz, E. (2008). *Grammar and Interaction: Pivots in German conversation.* (S. A. Thompson, & P. J. Hopper, Eds.) Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Betz, E. M., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond Grammar: Teaching Interaction in the German Language Classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German , 47* (2), 140-163.

Betz, E., & Golato, A. (2008). Remembering Relevant Information and Withholding Relevant Next Actions: The German Token achja. *Research on Language and Social Interaction , 41* (1), 58-98.

Bilmes, J. (1988). The Concept of Preference in Conversation Analysis. *Language in Society , 17* (2), 161-181.

Brown, L. (2013). Identity and honorifics use in Korean study abroad. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 269-298). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dailey-O'Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2006). Language learners' use of discourse markers as evidence for a mixed code. *International Journal of Bilingualism , 10* (1), 89-109.

Degand, L., Cornillie, B., & Pietrandrea, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and description.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Deppermann, A. (2009). Verstehensdefizit als Antwortverpfichtung: Interaktionale Eigenschaften der Modalpartikel denn in Fragen. In S. Günthner, & J. Bücker (Eds.), *Grammatik im Gespräch. Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung* (pp. 23-56). Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.

Deppermann, A., & Helmer, H. (2013). Zur Grammatik des Verstehens im Gespräch: Inferenzen anzeigen und Handlungskonsequenzen ziehen mit also und dann. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft , 32* (1), 1-39.

Diewald, G. (2013). "Same same but different" - Modal particles, discourse markers and the art (and purpose) of categorization. In L. Degand, B. Cornillie, & P. Pietrandrea (Eds.), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and description* (pp. 19-46). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diewald, G. (1999). Die dialogische Bedeutungskomponente von Modalpartikeln. In B. Naumann (Ed.), *Dialogue analysis and the mass media* (pp. 187-199). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Egbert, M. (2009). *Der Reparatur-Mechanismus in deutschen Gesprächen.* Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Egbert, M. (2004). Other-initiated repair and membership categorization-some conversational events that trigger linguistic and regional membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics , 36* (8), 1467-1498.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication.* London: Longman.

Fernandez, J. (2013). A corpus-based study of vague language use by learners of Spanish in a study abroad context. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and Cultural Aspects of Language Learning in Study Abroad* (pp. 299-332). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal* , 752-777. (Original work published in 1997).

Golato, A. (2012). German oh: Marking an Emotional Change of State. *Research on Language and Social Interaction , 45* (3), 245-268.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying Compliment Responses: A Comparison of DCTs and Recordings of Naturally Occurring Talk. *Applied Linguistics , 24* (1), 90-121.

Golato, A., & Betz, E. (2008). German ach and achso in repair uptake: Resources to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft , 27*, 7-37.

Hentschel, E., & Weydt, H. (1989). Wortartenprobleme bei Partikeln. In H. Weydt (Ed.), *Sprechen mit Partikeln* (pp. 3-18). Berlin; New York: de Gruyter.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 295-345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences. *Social Science and Medicine , 61* (2), 481-493.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis.* Cornwall, Great Britain: Polity Press.

Huth, T. (2011). Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse. *Language and Linguistics Compass , 5* (5), 297-309.

Imo, W. (2008). Individuelle Konstrukte oder Verboten einer neuen Konstruktion? Stellungsvarianten der Modalpartikel halt im Vor- und Nachfeld. In A. Stefanowitsch, & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik II. Von der Konstruktion zur Grammatik* (pp. 135-155). Tübingen: Stauffenberg.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation . In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York: Academic Press.

Kinginger, C. (Ed.). (2013). *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 229-256). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Klapper, J., & Rees, J. (2003). Reviewing the case for explicit grammar instruction in the university foreign language learning context. *Language Teaching Research , 7* (3), 285-314.

Koshik, I. (2005). *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assestive questions in everyday interaction.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lütten, J. (1979). Die Rolle der Partikeln doch, eben und ja als Konsensus-Konstitutiva in gesprochener Sprache. In H. Weydt (Ed.), *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache* (pp. 30-38). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

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

Mondada, L. (2015). The facilitator's task of formulating citizens' proposals in political meetings: Orchestrating multipile embodied orientations to recipients. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion , 16*, 1-62.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Second Language Acquisition: CA-SLA. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.* Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Aktinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding. *American Sociological Review , 68*, 939-967.

Sacks, H. (2004). An initial characterization of the oragnization of speaker turn-taking in conversation. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 35-46). Amsteran, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics , 12*, 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A., & Lerner, G. H. (2009). Beginning to Respond: Well-Prefaced Responses to Wh-Questions. *Research on Language & Social Interaction , 42* (2), 91-115.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language , 53* (2), 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation Analysis Methodology. *Language Learning , 54* (S1), 1-54.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). The Case of the Missing "No": The Relationship between Pedagogy and Interaction. *Language Learning , 47* (3), 547-583.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J., Bermann, P., Birkner, K., et al. (2011). A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2 translated and adapted for English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion , 12*, 1-51.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: an introduction.* Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stivers, T., & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society , 39*, 1-25.

Thurmair, M. (1989). *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Valdmets, A. (2013). Modal particles, discourse markers, and adverbs with lt-suffix in Estonian. In L. Degand, B. Cornillie, & P. Pietrandrea (Eds.), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and description* (pp. 107-132). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Whittington, A. (2008). *German 'also' in Telephone Closings and Repair.* Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures.

Zifonun, G., Hoffmann, L., Strecker, B., Ballweg, J., Braußе, U., Breindl, E., et al. (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache.* (H.-W. Eroms, G. Stickel, & G. Zifonun, Eds.) Berlin: de Gruyter.

8 Appendix A: Summary Of The Most Important GAT 2 Transcription Conventions For A Minimal and Basic Transcript (Selting, et al., 2011, pp. 37-38)

Table 10: Summary of the most important GAT 2 transcription conventions for a minimal transcript (Selting, et. al., 2011, pp. 37-38)

Sequential structure	
[ ] [ ]	overlap and simultaneous talk
* * ** **	talk/gaze overlap
In- and outbreaths	
°h/h°	in-/outbreaths of appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
°hh/hh°	in-/outbreaths of appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
°hhh/hhh°	in-/outbreaths of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
Pauses	
(.)	micro pause, estimated, up to 0.2 sec. duration appr.
(-)	short estimated pause of appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
(--)	intermediary estimated pause of appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
(---)	longer estimated pause of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
(0.5)/(2.0)	measured pause of appr. 0.5/2.0 sec. duration (to tenth of a second)
Other segmental conventions	
and_uh	cliticizations within units
uh, uhm, etc.	hesitation markers, so-called "filled pauses"
Laughter and crying	
haha hehe hihi	syllabic laughter
((laughs)) ((cries))	description of laughter and crying
<<laughing> >	laughter particles accompanying speech with indication of scope
<<:-)> so>	smile voice
Continuers	
hm, yes, no, yeah etc.	monosyllabic tokens
hm_hm, ye_es, no_o	by-syllabic tokens
?hm?hm	with glottal closure, often negating
Other conventions	
((coughs))	non-verbal vocal actions and events
<<coughing> >	...with indication of scope
( )	unintelligible passage
(xxx), (xxx xxx)	one or two unintelligible syllables
(may i)	assumed wording
(may i say/let us say)	possible alternatives
((unintelligble, appr. 3 sec))	unintelligible passage with indication of duration

((...))	omission in transcript
=>	refers to a line of transcript relevant in the argument
word	refers to a word in the transcript relevant in the argument

Table 11: Summary of the most important GAT 2 transcription conventions for a basic transcript (Selting, et al., 2011, pp. 37-38)

Sequential structure	
=	fast, immediate continuation with a new turn or segment (latching)
Other segmental conventions	
:	lengthening, by about 0.2-0.5 sec.
::	lengthening, by about 0.5-0.8 sec.
:::	lengthening, by about 0.8-1.0 sec.
?	cut-off by glottal closure
Accentuation	
SYLlable	focus accent
!SYL!lable	extra strong accent
Final pitch movements of intonation phrases	
?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
-	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low
Other conventions	
<<surprised> >	interpretive comment with indication of scope

Gaze change is noted above the line in which it occurs.